

CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT

HEARINGS
BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
ON
S. J. Res. 87
PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF
THE UNITED STATES RECOGNIZING THE AUTHORITY
AND LAW OF JESUS CHRIST

MAY 13 AND 17, 1954

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota, *Chairman*

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah

ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, New Jersey

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois

HERMAN WELKER, Idaho

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

PAT MCCARRAN, Nevada

HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota, *Chairman*

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee

WAYNE H. SMITHEY, *Subcommittee Counsel*

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement of—	
Applewhite, Miss Nancy	9
Breslau, Rabbi Isidore, Washington, D. C., on behalf of the Synagogues Council of America	69
Brody, David, counsel, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith	86
Coleman, John, professor of political science, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa.	15
De Shishmareff, Mrs. P., on behalf of the California League of Christian Parents	2, 7
Elliott, D. H., member of the executive committee of the National Reform Association	35
Howard, Dr. Clinton N., superintendent of the International Reform Federation, Washington, D. C.	50
McFarland, A. J., field secretary of the Christian Amendment Move- ment	23
McKnight, R. J. G., president emeritus, Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.	31
McKnight, T. C., president, Christian Amendment Movement	40
Martin, R. H., president, National Reform Association, Pittsburgh, Pa.	45
Patterson, J. Rewick, D. D., executive secretary of the National Reform Association	43
Pfeffer, Leo, counsel, Synagogue Council of America and National Community Relations Advisory Council	74
Robb, G. M., lecturer	33
Robb, R. E., Columbia, S. C.	26
Robb, Remo I., member, executive committee, Christian Amendment Movement	21
Willson, S. Bruce, president, Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.	18
Exhibits:	
Copy of Senate Joint Resolution 87, 83d Congress	1
Resolution adopted by the Christian Patriotic Rally, Reseda, Calif.	2
Letter of the Library of Congress, dated September 7, 1954	3
Page 23 of the March 1951 issue of Facts, a publication of the American Jewish Committee, New York, N. Y., with commentary by the Christian Patriotic Rally of Reseda, Calif.	11
Letter of Our Sunday Visitor, Catholic weekly, dated September 27, 1954	25
Rev. Peter Marshall's address, New Glory for the Old Glory as printed in the Congressional Record	54
A copy of the Christian Patriot	57
A discussion of the church-state problem	59
Constitution of the Christian Amendment Movement	59
A pamphlet, Christ Is Our Moral Governor	61
Billy Graham's sermon, The Faith of George Washington as printed in the Congressional Record	66
Statements submitted by—	
California League of Christian Parents, La Jolla, Calif.	6
Christian Patriotic Rally, Reseda, Calif.	14
Delber H. Elliott, Precedents in Colonial Documents and State Constitutions	37
Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the State of Pennsylvania	52
Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council	78

IV

CONTENTS

APPENDIX

	Page
Statement of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Washington, D. C.-----	82
Telegram of League for Safeguarding Fixity of the Sabbath, New York, N. Y.-----	83
Letter of the American Ethical Union, New York, N. Y.-----	84
Letter of American Civil Liberties Union, New York, N. Y.-----	85
Letter of American Jewish Committee, New York, N. Y.-----	85

CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT

THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1954

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:45 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, Senator William Langer (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senator Langer.

Present also: Wayne H. Smithey, subcommittee counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come to order. You may proceed.

Mr. SMITHEY. Senator, this is a hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 87, introduced by Senator Flanders, by request, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recognizing the law and authority of Jesus Christ.

If it is agreeable with the chairman, I will insert a copy of that resolution at this point in the record.

(S. J. Res. 87 is as follows:)

[S. J. Res. 87, 83d Cong., 1st sess.]

JOINT RESOLUTION Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions or legislatures in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.

"SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or a peaceful assemblage.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

Chairman LANGER. Call the first witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mrs. P. de Shishmareff, president of the California League of Christian Parents. Would you come forward, please.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. P. DE SHISHMAREFF, PRESIDENT,
CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF CHRISTIAN PARENTS**

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. Mr. Chairman, we came all the way from California to see what we could do about the Christian amendment, which is a joint resolution. We wanted to know how much could be done in order to press it on the floor of Congress. Our League of Christian Parents was founded because we found in California the situation, especially among the children and young people, is just about the worst in the United States. It is probably worse than New York.

Chairman LANGER. Whom are you appearing for?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. I am appearing for the California League of Christian Parents.

Chairman LANGER. How many members have you?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. I would say of registered members we have about 200. We are affiliated with other organizations that also have their own membership. We are working quite a great deal. Each of our members, for instance, takes 10 other people who put out all the things that we want to do in our legislature in California. So that when we have to have the hearings in our California Legislature for the schools, the assemblymen and senators received thousands of letters from all these people. Each one does a multiplication, you might call it. Each member undertakes to contact 10, and each 10 must contact 10 more. So that is the way the membership grows in California throughout the State.

Chairman LANGER. Did they pass a resolution authorizing you to appear here?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. Yes.

Chairman LANGER. Do you have a copy of the resolution with you?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. Yes, I have it here.

Chairman LANGER. It will be a part of the record.

(The resolution is as follows:)

CHRISTIAN PATRIOTIC RALLY,
Reseda, Calif., May 10, 1954.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that Miss Nancy D. Applewhite, acting chairman of the Militant Christian Patriots, and Mrs. P. de Shishmareff, president of the California League of Christian Parents have been appointed as the representatives of the Christian Patriotic Rally organization duly registered with the California State secretary.

The chairmen of the following organizations, also duly registered with the California State secretary, have likewise appointed Miss Nancy D. Applewhite and Mrs. P. de Shishmareff as their representatives, concurring fully in their endeavors to secure swift consideration by Congress and prompt passing of the Christian amendment by both the Senate and House during the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

Christian Patriotic Rally, Charles J. Schreiber; Christian Parents for Better Education, Walter Blount; Christian Victory Center, Mrs. Alma Shannon; Our Lady's Crusaders, D. J. Lauzon; United Christian Action, Robert P. Hughes.

Chairman LANGER. Do you happen to know how many members these other organizations have?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. I do not know. They work throughout the State, but mostly in southern California. We do reach, all of us together, a great number of people.

Chairman LANGER. You may proceed.

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. We are very much interested in the Christian amendment because we think, all of use, that it could probably be a great incentive to everybody, not only California, to have, just as the Christian amendment movement puts it, to have the United States declared a Christian nation, which has never been done. It was not done, as you all know, no doubt, because this was in the Constitution and it was framed after the French Revolution, which was atheistic from beginning to end. Because of this, this was left out.

In 1863, 21 men went to President Lincoln and asked him to remedy that in the Constitution, the fact that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ had been omitted. I do not know whether you know it, but Lincoln answered that we are at present in a terrible war, but as soon as this is over, I will attend to this and have it corrected. As you all know, he could not do it. Death took him before he could do this.

The 21 men, who were mostly ministers, who had taken up the question, were very much under the influence of J. D. Morse, the father of the inventor of the telegraph. He feared that probably what happened in the French Revolution might happen here. He wrote a very famous letter to George Washington telling him to beware of this influence. Anyway, it had been passed over.

In 1863, these people who did want to have America declared a Christian nation went to see President Lincoln. It was not done at that time.

Chairman LANGER. Where can you get a copy of the letter written to George Washington?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. It was in the research room of the New York Public Library.

Chairman LANGER. Will you see that a copy of that is secured and made a part of the record, Mr. Smithey?

(See letter below.)

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington 25, D. C., September 7, 1954.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,

Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,

United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.

(Attention Mr. Smithey.)

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: In reply to the request of August 31 regarding a letter which had allegedly been written to President Washington by the Reverend Jedediah Morse, father of Samuel F. B. Morse, urging Washington to declare this a Christian nation, a careful check of Lincoln biographies fails to reveal any such letter. The custodian of the Washington manuscripts here has also failed to discover any such letter. The Reverend Jedediah Morse was a very prominent Congregational clergyman, now chiefly remembered as the "Father of American Geography." He did have some correspondence with Washington and there exists a letter from Morse to Washington, dated February 1, 1799, enclosing a copy of Morse's Thanksgiving sermon. It is, however, merely a covering letter and we do not have a copy of the sermon.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH, *Director.*

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. These 21 people who started asking for this reform and amendment formed themselves into a society which became the National Reform Association, which is sponsoring the League of Christian Parents.

Shall I go on from here telling you how we were formed?

Chairman LANGER. Go right ahead. Say anything you want to say. We will be very glad to hear you.

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. We were very much disturbed about the fact that in California the actual teaching of religion is absolutely forbidden. We were working on a bill which has been presented already in Sacramento asking the return of the Bible in the school. It is called the Bible-reading bill. We were working on that very hard as a member of the National Reform Association.

Chairman LANGER. What excuse do they give for not reading the Bible in the school?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. I would like to know.

Chairman LANGER. I am asking you.

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. I do not think there is any excuse. They say it would really be infringing upon the rights of the people who are not Christians. That is in one sentence what they say.

We were working on the Bible-reading bill with the National Reform Association, of which I am a board member, when there appeared in the press what you probably remember, the most awful case in Phoenix, Ariz., which is called the Gusick case. It had to do with the perversion of young children in Phoenix. That is what came out during the trial. That of course incenses us terribly, because what adults do is one thing; what is done to children is quite another. So we followed the case which was taking place in Phoenix.

Chairman LANGER. Do you have a copy of that decision with you?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. Yes. We were so incensed about what was being done to little children, 8 or 9, for instance, that we created this League of Christian Parents to see what we could do.

Chairman LANGER. Will this lady identify herself?

Miss APPLEWHITE. Miss Nancy Applewhite of Pasadena, Calif.

Chairman LANGER. Have you the decision of the Gusick case?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. It is in here.

Chairman LANGER. We will mark it "Exhibit A," and make it a part of the record.

(The material was not furnished for the record.)

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. These are older clippings of the press at the time.

Chairman LANGER. We would be glad to have you insert them in the record also, if you wish.

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. Certainly. This was in 1951, just 3 years ago.

(The newspaper clippings were not submitted.)

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. Guzik was convicted. They tried to take him out of the State, and his father, who is a noted gangster in Chicago, as you know, tried to get him out of Arizona, so it would not come before the courts. But they had to bring him back, and he is at present in jail.

We knew things were bad, because we are near the border in California, and we knew that the children or young people were going over and getting drugs and heroin and marihuana. We had tried to work against the narcotics among the young people. We do not care what happens to adults; it is their own doing. We were working very hard with our district attorney, John Keller, to try to stop the young people going over the border and getting drugs. All this came together so that the League of Christian Parents took all the

different aspects of the work that had to be done in order to protect young people, and save, if it was possible, those who had already been drawn into downright evil.

This really is the work of our league. We feel that if the children were given an even chance of being given the Christian principles of morality of which they are being deprived, sometimes as well in their homes as in the schools, we might probably be able to bring up the new generation with Christian principles and all this evil would probably disappear gradually. Of course, in time it would. After all, if it did not exist when I was a child, I do not see why it has to exist for those who are children today. That is why we are supporting the Christian amendment as hard as we can.

If America is declared a Christian nation, there will be a chance now, with hard work, to see the schools taking up the Christian teaching of morality. It cannot hurt anybody else, even if they are not Christian. Morality must be the same for all of us. So this is why we are supporting as much as we can and as hard as we can the Christian amendment.

There is the Christian amendment movement—I do not know whether they are represented here today—who have done marvelous work about it. They helped frame the Christian amendment which Senator Flanders, as you know, introduced.

This is our reason for the support of this amendment.

Chairman LANGER. There is a telegram here in opposition. Will you read the telegram?

Mr. SMITHEY. It is addressed to Hon. William F. Langer, chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

We have just learned that public hearings are scheduled to be held today on a proposal to amend the Constitution so as to recognize the law and authority of Jesus Christ. We believe this proposal does violence to the tradition of religious freedom and the separation of church and state upon which our democracy is founded. We call your committee's attention to the fact that such a proposal was made to, and rejected by, the fathers of our Constitution, whose purpose it was to establish a nation in which all faiths shall forever be free and equal. We respectfully record our opposition, and if this proposal is to be given further consideration by your committee, we respectfully request an opportunity to appear and present our opposition.

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
110 West 42d Street, New York.

Chairman LANGER. They will be given an opportunity to present their evidence. Set that for Monday afternoon if we do not have another hearing. Notify them by telegram. The ladies may wish to stay.

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. We would, because we have gone as far as we can in hearing all sides and giving our support as much as we can.

Chairman LANGER. Miss Applewhite, do you wish to make a statement?

Miss APPLEWHITE. Will I have an opportunity next Monday? I would prefer to do it then.

Chairman LANGER. Very well.

Mrs. BETHUNE. I am Mrs. Bethune. I live at 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Chairman LANGER. Would you prefer to testify now or Monday?

Mrs. BETHUNE. I would prefer to testify next Monday.

Chairman LANGER. I would like to make this statement that she had a part of the record.

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. P. DE SHISHMAREFF, CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF CHRISTIAN PARENTS, LA JOLLA, CALIF.

The California League of Christian Parents was founded as a result of the indignation aroused when, in the course of the trial of Charles Guzik in Phoenix, Ariz., it was revealed that there were in existence "national rings of perversion of young children."

Trying to find the causes of ever-growing juvenile delinquency, as also remedies for this evil, is the aim pursued by the members of our organization. We have worked strenuously with the authorities in southern California who were endeavoring to curb the narcotics traffic, most specially with the San Diego district attorney, Mr. Don Keller.

We have fully realized that immorality and the corruption of young people are largely due to the almost complete lack of Christian principles of morality which are no longer part of the traditional teaching in our American schools.

An official declaration that America is a Christian Nation would of itself tend toward a reestablishment of Christian principles as formulated in the Christian amendment; to attain this goal is one of the aims of the League of Christian Parents, and other Christian groups in California, namely: The Christian Patriotic Rally, the Militant Christian Patriots, Christian Parents for Better Education, Christian United Action, Christian Valley Center, California Christian Citizens Association, for which Miss Nancy D. Applewhite and the undersigned are the accredited representatives during their stay in Washington.

Mr. SMITHEY. The committee has also received a statement addressed to you from Glenn L. Archer, executive director, Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State, with offices at 1633 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., which they ask to be included in the record.

Chairman LANGER. You might notify them, too, about the hearing. They can be represented if they wish.

Mr. SMITHEY. I will withhold submission of this, then, until Monday.

(Thereupon, at 11 a. m., a recess was taken until Monday, May 17, 1954, at 10 a. m.)

CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1954

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, Hon. William Langer (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senator Langer.

Present also: Wayne H. Smithey, subcommittee counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. Call your first witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Miss Nancy Applewhite.

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. Call your next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mrs. Nagene Bethune.

The CHAIRMAN. She testified the other day.

Mr. SMITHEY. She was here and asked to appear again. She said in correspondence with the committee, Senator, that she may not be able to be present and she would like to have Mrs. de Shishmareff recognized for the purpose of making a further statement.

Mrs. de Shishmareff.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a statement?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to read it?

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. Will it be too long if I read all this?

The CHAIRMAN. Some of you gentlemen sit around the table where you can hear. This thing is very informal here.

That is right, do not stand on ceremony at all. Ask any questions you want to ask the lady. She will ask any questions she wants to ask you. We are here for the American people, and want to do what is right. That is all we are interested in. No formality here at all.

If you want to interrupt her at any time, interrupt her.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am not going to swear you like I generally do my witnesses because I am looking at you and I can see you are all honest.

So you go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF MRS. P. DE SHISHMAREFF, ON BEHALF OF THE CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF CHRISTIAN PARENTS

Mrs. DE SHISHMAREFF. The policy of the Christian amendment, at present the subject of hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, presided over by Senator William Langer, reverts to fundamental principles.

The fact that among the framers of the Constitution several men had adopted the Jacobin atheistic theories of the French Revolution of 1789 explains the omission in the Constitution of the statement that America is a Christian nation.

As is well known, the destruction or abolition of Christianity in both the French Revolution, 1789, and the Russian Revolution of 1917 was the primary aim of anarchistic atheists who, in the concealed deliberations of their secret societies, had sworn to overthrow thrones and altars.

However, the constitutions of such States as Virginia, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Delaware, and New York all strongly emphasize their allegiance to the Christian faith and devotion to its doctrine.

In this connection it is not amiss to recall the words of Chancellor Kent, the great commentator on American law, speaking as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New York in the case, *The People v. Ruggles*:

The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity as the rule of their faith and practice, and to scandalize the author of these doctrines is not only, in a religious point of view, extremely impious, but even in respect of the obligations due to society, is a gross violation of decency and good order. * * *

The full equal and undisturbed decent discussions on any religious subject is granted and secured, but to revile, with malicious and blasphemous contempt, the religion professed by almost the whole community is an abuse of that right. Nor are we bound, by any expression in the Constitution as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately, the like attacks upon the religion of Mahomet or of the Grand Lama; and for this plain reason, that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines of worship of those impostors."

The influence of Christianity in the development of America is evidenced in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Holy Trinity Church versus the United States as delivered by Justice Brewer in 1892:

If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs, and its society we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth. Among other matters note the following: The form of oath universally prevailing concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the custom of opening sessions of all deliberative bodies and most conventions with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills "In the name of God, amen"; the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath with the general cessation of all secular business and the closing of courts, legislatures, and other similar public assemblies on that day; the churches and church organizations which abound in every city, town, and hamlet; the multitude of charitable organizations existing everywhere under Christian auspices; the gigantic missionary associations with general support, and aiming to establish Christian missions in every quarter of the globe. These and many other matters which might be noticed add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian Nation.

Christianity, not a denomination, was even said to be part of the common law of Pennsylvania.

In the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, the statement was clearly made that this is a Christian nation.

America is a Christian not an atheistic nation; yet we are witnessing the fact that our system of education is turning American children into young atheists when the teaching of the doctrine and practices of Christianity are banned from our schools.

The founders of the American Nation were Christians; they had braved all perils to seek freedom of religion and they granted religious freedom to all religions and even sects; they never foresaw that a non-Christian or anti-Christian minority could infiltrate, corrupt, and finally even dominate the political, spiritual, and moral life of the Nation and work for the ultimate destruction of Christianity and the abolition of its principles of morality. Yet, in our days, communism has attained this odious goal.

Deprived of the sound teaching of Christian morality our children have become the victims of perverted schemers. Christianity alone can stem the tide of corruption and immorality. The tolerance practiced by the American Christians has reached the highest possible degree, but it has been sorely abused.

Christians are still in the majority in the United States and their request to Congress that the Christian amendment be passed must be given serious consideration and without delay.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Call your next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Miss Nancy Applewhite.

STATEMENT OF MISS NANCY APPLEWHITE

Miss APPLEWHITE. The need for the Christian amendment.

Our forefathers were devout Christians and braved hardships in order to seek religious freedom in this strange new land and would be amazed at the situation in which we now find ourselves.

Indeed, the time has come when the fact that the United States of America is a Christian nation must be acknowledged in an amendment to our Constitution in order to protect Christianity from the attacks of anti-Christians who seek to violate the teachings and practice.

In the March 1951 issue of Facts, a publication of the American Jewish Committee, whose address is 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y., there is a statement of program and policy which shows to what extent these planned attacks are being carried out.

Pages 20 through part of 24 and page 32 are respectfully recommended for careful study by the committee. May I read a few excerpts?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, you may.

Miss APPLEWHITE. This is the publication.

The CHAIRMAN. We will mark it "Exhibit A" for identification.

Miss APPLEWHITE. I would prefer not to turn it in. It is the only one I have. I could order another one.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Miss APPLEWHITE. It is the only one I have.

A. J. C., the American Jewish Committee, together with the A. D. L., and the Anti-Defamation League, has for many years been a primary source of support for the Bureau of Intercultural Education, dedicated to the promotion of better understanding among school children of the many races and nationalities that make up America.

There is a pressing need for intensive work with textbooks and study materials utilized in public schools and colleges of this country. A recent survey of such materials conducted by the American Council of Education, states:

"Most of the material about Jews in texts is about the ancient Jews. Three-fourths of the space devoted to them in world history texts deals with events before 79 A. D. Students are left with the impression that the Jewish religion and Jewish culture have changed very little since that time.

"To make matters worse, many of the accounts of the Crucifixion in world histories are too general to be fully accurate, and some provide a basis for the development of prejudice against the Jews. When textbooks state or imply that all Jews wished to have Jesus put to death, or that the killing of Jesus was actually committed by Jews, there is clearly need for better scholarship and care in writing. Some textbooks make one or both of these mistakes."

I am taking excerpts because I cannot read the whole thing.

"Several textbooks in modern problems mention briefly the relationship of the Jewish-Christian tradition to the ideals of democracy. But no text makes a major point of the remarkably close relationship of the Jewish religious ideals to American democracy."

Accordingly, contacts have been established with textbook publishers and school boards in several communities to determine proper and effective remedial action with respect to current textbooks.

We must continue our activities with youth-serving, character-building organizations, such as Boy and Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, etc.

This awareness has come about through intensive conferences, preparation of materials for use by youth leaders (leaders' guides, films, etc., planning and participation in human relations seminars, youth forums, etc.).

AJC staff members actively participate in the planning and research for the 1950 White House Conference on Children and Youth in a Democracy, a conference convened every 10 years by the President of the United States to take stock of the needs of children and youth and to chart courses of action for the next decade.

AJC placed a full-time social scientist on the conference staff to gather material dealing with the effects of prejudice on children.

A staff member developed one aspect of the conference program dealing with religious needs of children.

Heads of AJC's scientific research department and youth division served directly as chairman and members of official program planning and research committees.

The AJC helped make possible the publication by Harper Bros., in 1950, of *The Jews, Their History, Culture, and Religion*, edited by Dr. Louis Finklestein. AJC also helped subsidize the publication of the encyclopedia, *The Jewish People, Past and Present*.

AJC called wide attention to the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Temple Beth Elohim, in Charleston, S. C., as it did to the dedication of Touro Synagogue, in Newport, R. I., as a national shrine in 1947; and, together with the ADL, it helped subsidize a commemorative volume on *The Jews of Charleston*.

AJC produces special radio network programs in connection with Jewish holidays and other special events, such as the dramatization of John Hersey's *The Wall for Passover of 1950*.

AJC will continue its weekly Television Chapel shows to bring to country-wide audiences an understanding of the ideological and religious values inherent in Judaism. It plans to greatly expand its use of television for creating better understanding of the American pattern.

It will continue its educational activities to develop in Americans an understanding of, and sympathy toward, the State of Israel—its achievements and hopes for the future.

In its sponsorship of *Commentary*—recently described by John Dewey as "the greatest magazine of its kind in the English language"—a magazine read by Government officials, educators, and leading American-opinion molders, the committee promotes Jewish cultural interests and creative achievement in America and clarifies public opinion on problems of Jewish concern.

We believe that early attitudes of hostility are often firmly implanted through perpetuation of historical inaccuracies about Jews and Judaism in Christian teaching.

Under the auspices of Drew Theological Seminary, we have conducted an exhaustive study of religious textbooks, currently used in Protestant schools. Errors, misstatements and misconceptions of the historic role of the Jews in the earliest days of Christianity have been and will continue to be tabulated and brought to the attention of Protestant educators and textbook publishers. As a result of new insights gained through these efforts there has been steady and significant progress in the elimination of such material. Similar work on a more limited scale is being carried on with respect to Catholic Sunday and parochial school materials.

Catholic school authorities in New York have recently completed for publication a Syllabus on Intercultural Education. The syllabus was experimentally developed in the parochial classes of greater New York, and may be adopted in other dioceses. AJC staff acted in a consultative capacity in this project.

Close cooperation is maintained with the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington, D. C. Educational material was made available to that organization for use in more than 100 Catholic high schools throughout the country.

A teachers unit on the history of Jews in America, to be utilized in connection with teacher training in the Catholic University of America, has been completed with the cooperation of AJC.

Progress has been made in the introduction of competent instruction in Jewish theology, ethics, history, and contemporary Jewish affairs into the curriculums of Christian theological seminaries and teacher training institutes. We have made it possible for Christian theological students to receive instruction in Jewish theological seminaries through provision of several graduate fellowships for such purposes.

We supply Christian religious publications with prepared materials, articles, and stories, depicting Jewish life, Jewish spiritual heritage, and Jewish religious values as well as articles on current issues which particularly affect American Jews.

Through the newly created Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches, the AJC and ADL will jointly have an unprecedented opportunity to aid in the preparation of lesson materials, study guides, audio-visual aids, etc., for use in educational activities sponsored by the Protestant churches and organizations.

An analysis of films depicting the crucifixion story, used in religious educational activities, was completed during 1950 and the results were made available to community councils through the National Community Relations Advisory Council. Steps are now being taken in cooperation with leading educators and film producers to modify those films believed to affect adversely Jewish-Christian relationships.

A more complete survey is currently underway to discover distortions as well as omissions with respect to Jews and Judaism, past and present. Since over 30,000 Protestant churches now use films and film strips as part of their educational program, this provides an important area in which corrective action is indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions on the part of anyone?

Rabbi BRESLAU. I have tried to follow the evidence. I would like to know in what context the lady has presented this, whether it is in defense or in opposition to the resolution.

Miss APPLEWHITE. It shows the need for protection against attacks on the Christians.

Rabbi BRESLAU. In other words, the lady interpreted this statement as an attack on Christianity?

Miss APPLEWHITE. Yes.

Since I have only one complete copy, I will leave with the committee some photostats of page 23, and then there is a short commentary by the Christian Patriotic Rally of Reseda, Calif.

(The document referred to is as follows:)

CHRISTIAN PATRIOTIC RALLY, RESEDA, CALIF.

The fusion of Christianity and Talmudic Judaism having become the policy of what is currently called Interfaith, it behooves all professing Christians, Catholics and Protestants alike, to study the process whereby such fusion is created and operated. In order to escape the inevitable state of confusion which must arise from the development of such a measure, it is urgent to search for the seat of control of the ideology of interfaith and the means used for its diffusion and growth.

A booklet entitled "Facts" issued by the American Jewish Committee (see below) seems to furnish the needed answer to this quest. For all Christians who share the belief in the incompatibility of the Christian Gospels with the Jewish Talmud and its antisocial laws, it may come as a sad shock to have to

admit the fact that, even the religious teaching of Christians is controlled by Jews whose spiritual life is based upon the books of the Talmud wherein, not only the divinity of Christ, the virgin birth, the nativity, but the whole life of Our Lord and His crucifixion and blasphemously derided.

It is the obvious duty of all Christians to pause and reflect upon the dire consequences of forwarding the policy of interfaith and the control of Christianity by Talmudic Judaism.

The quotations inside this folder clearly establish under whose tutelage is established the control of Judeo-Christianity.

C. J. SCHREIBER.

Let the Christians now ponder over the following declaration as expressed in the report of the Central Conference of American Rabbis in 1901:

"The position of Judaism in respect of the founder of Christianity is altogether negative, namely, as denying His divinity. Though the pivot on which Christianity revolves, Jesus of Nazareth has no place in Jewish theology."

No declaration can be clear or more complete; therein "interfaith" finds no place.

How can members of the Christian hierarchy of the Catholic and Protestant churches allow the intrusion and injection of the Talmudist spirit into their midst and submit to its control over their field of religious education? Should not their main care be the teaching of unadulterated Christian doctrine, especially where school-age children are concerned? Are they deliberately overlooking the experimental elimination of the nativity scenes produced in public schools in White Plains, N. Y., in 1950 and many similar incidents?

The revision of Christian religious texts and Sunday-school materials is clearly outlined in the American Jewish Year Book 1952, where mention is also made of a memorandum which was released by the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League not only opposing released time arrangements for religious instruction, but stressing that any such arrangements must exclude the use of public-school facilities and classrooms (p. 120). Also in 1951, on June 20, the Central Conference of American Rabbis called for opposition to Bible reading and religious observance in the public schools.

The contrast between the AJC and CCAR's virulent hostility toward Christ and Christianity and their planned determined infiltration and control of Christian education through the exploitation of misguided tolerance is indeed evident. Their boast of success is fully justified.

The sorrowful concern of lay Christians is due to the defection of their hierarchic leaders who transgressed their duty of vigilance and delivered their fold to the enemy bent on the annihilation of Christianity, through corruption of its very core. Christian leaders who allowed the distortion of facts concerning the nativity and crucifixion of Jesus Christ in accordance with orders emanating from the AJC and the ADL are violating the Christian faith, and their acts are religious treason. Treason cannot be measured by degrees, for it carries the fullness of its abomination within its very essence.

Let all true believers in Jesus Christ and His divinity, in the Redeemer, Comforter and Savior of human souls lift up their voices and demand that an immediate end be put to the evil control now being exercised over Christian teaching in America. Let it be proclaimed throughout the Nation that the purity of the Christian doctrine and faith not only cannot mingle with the Talmud and Schulchan Aruch Jewish teaching, but most certainly that the formulation of its religious education cannot be delivered to the secular enemies of Christ and Christianity.

FACTS ABOUT THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE—A STATEMENT OF PROGRAM AND POLICY, BY THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

"Under the auspices of Drew Theological Seminary, *we have conducted an exhaustive study of religious textbooks* currently used in Protestant schools. Errors, misstatements, and misconceptions of the historic role of the Jews in the earliest days of Christianity have been and will continue to be tabulated and brought to the attention of Protestant educators and textbook publishers. As a result of new insights gained through these efforts, there has been steady and significant progress in the elimination of such material. Similar work on a more limited scale is being carried on with respect to Catholic Sunday and parochial school materials.

"Catholic school authorities in New York have recently completed for publication a Syllabus on Intercultural Education. The Syllabus was experimentally developed in the parochial classes of greater New York, and may be adopted

in other dioceses. AJC staff acted in a consultative capacity in this project. "Close cooperation is maintained with the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington, D. C. Educational material was made available to that organization for use in more than 150 Catholic high schools throughout the country.

"A teachers' unit on the history of Jews in America, to be utilized in connection with teacher training in the Catholic University of America, has been completed with the cooperation of AJC.

"Progress has been made in the introduction of competent instruction in Jewish theology, ethics, history, and contemporary Jewish affairs into the curricula of Christian theological seminaries and teacher-training institutes. We have made it possible for Christian theological students to receive instruction in Jewish theological seminaries through provision of several graduate fellowships for such purposes.

"We supply Christian religious publications with prepared materials, articles, and stories, depicting Jewish life, Jewish spiritual heritage, and Jewish religious values as well as articles on current issues which particularly affect American Jews.

"Through the newly created Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches, the AJC and ADL will jointly have an unprecedented opportunity to aid in the preparation of lesson materials, study guides, audio-visual aids, etc., for use in educational activities sponsored by the Protestant churches and organizations.

"An analysis of films depicting the crucifixion story, used in religious educational activities, was completed during 1950 and the results were made available to community councils through the National Community Relations Advisory Council. Steps are now being taken in cooperation with leading educators and film producers to modify those films believed to affect adversely Jewish-Christian relationships."

Miss APPLEWHITE. The process of further weakening of Christianity is evidenced in the Bible in the hands of its creators by Moses Dvorey, which shows hatred of our Lord Jesus Christ and His teaching and the promulgation of the Mosaic law as the one-world religion.

This attack on Christianity is exposed in a pamphlet called Inter-faith, also put out by the Christian Patriotic Rally.

I should like to read a few excerpts giving you the cases in this book. On page 917:

Christianity is an accursed movement and her idol is Jesus.

Page 926:

Jesus was wicked, a sinner, a transgressor, a man of deceit, a rebeller against Jehovah. Jesus is the false prophet. He demanded of the Jews that they believe in Him as they believed in Moses. Jesus demanded for Himself the right of Moses. He wanted to become the God of Israel. He wanted to inherit the place of Moses.

Page 240:

Jesus had none with whom to make a covenant and therefore was not known by either the least nor by the greatest. Therefore He sent His disciples to hunt adherents for Him at least from among the gentiles and therefore His adherents knew about Jesus only from written tales, told scores of years after His death, and therefore Jesus did not write His laws or, correctly, the laws of His disciples which had been stolen from others, and therefore were it not for those same foolish tales of the New Testament there would be no recollection of Jesus even among His believers.

Page 234:

The New Testament of Christianity is in its very foundation a lie.

There are many, many others. I think this is sufficient. I will turn this over to the committee.

Rabbi BRESLAU. What is the Devorey Bible?

Miss APPLEWHITE. It is a Jewish Bible. You can look it up in the library. It is obtainable in all public libraries.

For the record, I wish to present to the committee a comprehensive argument in favor of the Christian amendment which was issued by the Christian Patriotic Rally. Copies have already been mailed to every Member of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. They will be filed and made a part of the record.

MISS APPLEWHITE. I will not take the time to read it, but it is a marvelous discussion of the need for the Christian amendment.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTIAN PATRIOTIC RALLY, RESEDA, CALIF., ON THE CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT

There is before the Senate Judiciary Committee Senate Joint Resolution 87 which was introduced by Senator Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont. It is called the Christian amendment and reads:

"SECTION 1. This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, savior and ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.

"SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

The initial step in this campaign for the Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States was taken by the organizers of the National Reform Association, founded in 1863, being undenominational and unsectarian. Whether the omission of the name of God or Christ in the Constitution wording was planned or accidental is still a matter of opinion. Whereas the Christian spirit did animate some of the framers and supporters of the Constitution, it is, however, well to remember that others among them shared the atheistic ideas and theories of the French revolutionists and were affiliated to secret societies, whose avowed aims and purposes were the abolition of Christianity.

The famous letter of Jedidiah Morse to George Washington on this subject expressed the apprehension of those American Christians who rightly feared that the atheistic influence might dominate the decisions of the framers of the Constitution.

To students of present-day conditions of our American Government as of other currents which point to a steady deviation from all Christian principles of morality, justice, freedom, law, and order in our national life, this root of corruption which is poisoning the ranks of the American people all over the Nation is traceable to the steady eradication of Christianity, at all social levels of our population.

No defense was made against the steady infiltration of anti-Christ theories and practices by those who were leaders in our instituted religious and educational systems, which are the direct vehicles destined to safeguard and convey tradition to the people; thus, step by step, incredulity and irreligion crept in and supplanted Christian faith and its moral code.

If all Christians devoted to their faith will make every effort within their means requesting the speedy passage of the Christian amendment, America will soon be loudly proclaimed a Christian Nation by the will of the people. Let each one of us look upon a child as a potential savior or wrecker of the Nation according to the degree of vigilance or negligence concerning the knowledge and love of Christ being brought to or withheld from his little soul. Christian faith and loyal patriotism are his heritage; they should be guaranteed to him by the Constitution being amended as required.

Repentance for the regrettable omission in the wording of the Constitution must be followed by militant work throughout the country for the Christian amendment.

Evil is the negation of good, whereas Jesus Christ is good incarnate, truly the divine Son of God, Whose authority and law must be recognized and proclaimed by our Christian Nation.

CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF CHRISTIAN PARENTS.
CHRISTIAN PATRIOTIC RALLY.
CHRISTIAN VICTORY CENTER.
MILITANT CHRISTIAN PATRIOTS.
CHRISTIAN PARENTS FOR BETTER EDUCATION.

The Southern California branch of the National Reform Association is at 406 East Walnut Street, Santa Ana, Calif. Rev. Walter McCarroll, D. D., is president.

The Christian amendment movement is at 804 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. The president is Rev. T. C. McKnight, D. D. The publication of the Christian movement is the Christian Patriot.

The CHAIRMAN. Call your next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. John Coleman.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN COLEMAN, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL
SCIENCE, GENEVA COLLEGE, BEAVER FALLS, PA.**

Mr. COLEMAN. Senator, I have been asked by our group to act as a sort of bench manager and call on them severally. We are going to endeavor to hold our remarks down to reasonable limits.

Mr. PFEFFER. Would it not be fair to allow the opponents of the resolution to express their comments?

The CHAIRMAN. You will all have a chance to be heard.

Mr. PFEFFER. Mr. Coleman has a number of witnesses, we are sure, and we are only two.

The CHAIRMAN. We had better take it in order. We will go along this way.

Mr. COLEMAN. I should like to preface my remarks by saying we are not here as anti-Semites. In our home town we have family worship and my wife reads the American Standard Revision with which we want to get acquainted and which has been much advertised of late.

I read the Jewish-English translation of the Old Testament. I am not sure but what I prefer the Jewish translation to the revised standard version.

Several years ago in our town there was a near-Fascist man who represented himself as a former head of the British Secret Service in this country. I wrote to the British consul in New York and he said there were a number of people who represented themselves as the heads of the British Secret Service in this country, and then he gave some account of the man.

The man slandered Rabbi Wise and his daughter most outrageously. I wrote to Rabbi Wise and I found several days ago letters from Rabbi Wise thanking me for having taken up his cause and sending him the information.

I have been teaching for a number of years. I have Jewish students. I presented this matter and one fine Jewish girl spoke up and said, "Professor, how about me?"

I said, "You believe the Jews are going to gain possession of Palestine?"

She said, "Yes."

"I believe the same thing."

That is before it had taken place as it now has.

"When they get possession of Palestine they will acknowledge the God of the Old Testament, Jehovah."

She said, "They certainly will."

"If the Messiah comes"—and she believes the Messiah is to come—"you will have him as your King?"

She said, "Yes."

My point was that the difference between her point of view and my point of view was not that the Messiah should be acknowledged, but as to the identity of the Messiah.

I believe, we believe, He has come. She believes He is going to come.

I have spoken to B'nai B'rith, to the AZA, the Jewish Young Peoples Organization, and the Jewish Temple on Peace, and quoted the second chapter of Isaiah:

They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. And He shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people.

and said that that prophecy was a prophecy that would be fulfilled when the Messiah came.

We believe it will come if His law is accepted. They believe it will come when the Messiah appears. Basically we differ on one issue, the identity of the Messiah.

For some of us who are Christians the reason for the Christian amendment is a personal matter and the command:

And do thou humbly worship Him because thy Lord is He.

For the statesman there is an urgent reason because of its bearing on the present crisis which concerns the very basis of our civilization.

As Arnold Toynbee, the British historian, states in his recent book, *Civilization on Trial*, our present secular program is not sufficient to meet the Communist attack, we must bring to bear the whole weight of our Christian conceptions and traditions. These meet the Communist conceptions head on.

Why do the champions of the Marxian philosophy deny every freedom won by centuries of blood, sweat, and tears, glory in the exploitation of national friendships, the breaking of solemn promises, the enslavement of millions in labor camps?

I remember back when Mr. Hoover took millions of dollars over to Russia to feed them when they were starving by the millions. During the war I have had students who were sunk, one of them twice, carrying goods to Russia that they might have arms to fight in their own defense.

They have 600 vessels that they have refused to return. America could not have extended the hand of friendship any more than she has and would now, if they were ready to accept it.

Why? It is because their doctrine teaches them to exploit national friendships and to utilize every courtesy to their own advantage, the breaking of solemn promises, the enslavement of millions in labor camps.

Is this not a logical consequence of the belief that there is no creator, no righteous providence, no fearful judgment day, that man is a mere animal with no immortal future, that individuals and nations are mere pawns to be sacrificed without remorse in the achievement of total power; doctrines that are frankly taught in Soviet schools from the primary grades up and must be accepted by the members of the Communist Party throughout the world?

There has always been a question and it has been raised a good many times, Mr. Chairman, as to how intellectual people get that way, how they come to adopt the Marxian program. The Marxian pro-

gram presents a unified and self-confident philosophy of life, a complete world view.

Can it be that we have been in some measure ineffective because our opposition, though most determined, has been negative and largely fragmentary; because we have forgotten that our freedoms came into being through the activities of men who also held a unified and self-consistent philosophy of the universe, lived according to its principles and often cheerfully died for it?

How much stronger would be our appeal if we presented the splendid realities of a God-made, God-governed, and God-redeemed world in contrast to the view which sees the world grinding on forever like a mill with no purpose, heart, mind, or will?

The best elements of our civilization are leaves torn from the book of Christianity, and unless we are loyal to the whole book we may lose even these.

Forgetting the faith of our fathers we are becoming more and more secular.

We read in Genesis that Cain "went out from before the presence of the Lord," and "builded a city," a civilization consciously and frankly without God.

America, which has been forgetting Him and His sovereignty, is now confronted by a mighty power building a city, like Cain, with no consideration of the laws of God or the rights of man.

We must with equal enthusiasm and with equal frankness follow the pattern of the city, the civilization whose builder and maker is God, so that when the winds blow and the storms rage and all that can be shaken is shaken, then we shall be steadfast and unmoved because "a mighty fortress is our God."

We are giving financial, and, in some degree, statesman leadership to the other nations of the world. They belonged, or once belonged to what is called Christendom.

We have tried to rally them on a military basis and that without too great efficiency.

In our own Senate we have one Senator after another who has expressed his fear that while we were taking the lead we would not have allies who would follow us well. That would be tragic. We have poured out our wealth and our men on their behalf.

Let America lead the nations, as nations, to look to Him as the only way for forgiveness for their sins, and as Lord over all, and then they can with confidence look to Him for deliverance from the enemy within and the enemy without.

Senator, the greatest honor that can be attained by any statesman or Congress or administration is to be recorded in time and in eternity as having led our mighty Nation to an acceptance of our King and Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who is "overall, God blessed forever."

All people on earth do well to sing to the Lord with cheerful voice, the One Hundredth Psalm. Most of you have sung that in your services.

I have another paragraph or two, but I think I will end my presentation at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Call the next witness.

Mr. SMITHY. Mr. S. Bruce Willson.

**STATEMENT OF S. BRUCE WILLSON, PRESIDENT OF THE REFORMED
PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PITTSBURGH, PA.**

Mr. WILLSON. My name is S. Bruce Willson. I am from Pittsburgh, Pa. I have been asked by our floor manager to present a phase of this problem as it presents itself to the minds of many who have heard of this proposal for the first time.

The question of the separation of church and state has been brought to the fore with this matter of recognizing Almighty God in our national life or the Lord Jesus Christ.

The "separation of church and state" is a recognized principle of our American way of life, and one which is guarded more jealously, perhaps, by our people, than any other.

That there should be a zealous maintenance of this principle in the future is the conviction of the citizens who are seeking a favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 87. There has been a profound divergence of opinion as to whether a public acknowledgment of God in the basic law of our land would involve a change in this traditional concept of separation of church and state.

It is at this point that a clear distinction must be made. Such an acknowledgment of God does not imply an establishment of, nor the preferential recognition of, any denomination or sect. It does provide for an explicit declaration of the religious, moral, and spiritual foundations upon which democratic government must rest.

What separation means: A brief glance at our Nation's history sheds light on the meaning of the American concept of the separation of church and state. In 1787, delegates from 13 allied but intensely individualistic political units met in Philadelphia to form a Federal Constitution.

Among the many problems they faced was one which was serious enough to wreck their efforts to form a united Government. The problem was the establishment of a state religion. Of the 13 States, 5 accepted Congregationalism as the public religion. Two more had established the Episcopal Church. Five others had disestablished the Episcopal Church on becoming States for patriotic reasons. Three States never had an established church.

After long debate, the Founding Fathers of this Nation left undefined any reference to the establishment of any church. Shortly after the ratification of the Constitution by 11 States, the delegate reassembled to draw up amendments—the 10 which were adopted are known as the Bill of Rights. It was feared that if the new Federal Government was left free to set up a national religious establishment, the Union would be constantly endangered by struggles for dominance among representatives of contending religious bodies.

Religious liberty was desired, but along with it a prohibition against Government preference for any religious body. The practical solution adopted was the first amendment:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

The effect of the first amendment on State laws was gradually to disestablish such churches which had been established by law. It was not until 1833 that Massachusetts disestablished Congregationalism, and New Hampshire still retains in its constitution the provision that

the State legislature may devote public funds to maintain "public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality."

It is noteworthy that the New Hampshire Legislature has not exercised this power for over a century.

Following the War Between the States certain Western States desired admission to the Union. Congress imposed a Federal compact preventing them from establishing any church, and required them to place in their constitutions the law that:

perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of worship.

Other amendments have had more to say about religion as they have been interpreted by the courts. According to the decision of Circuit Justice Fields in 1879, the 14th amendment prevents:

Hostile and discriminating legislation by a State against persons of any class, sect, creed, or nation, in whatever form it may be expressed.

The union of church and state against which the Constitution makes careful prohibition involved the experience of other nations in the establishment of a particular church or denomination. This included:

1. Ownership of the church property by the state;
2. Employees of that church were paid out of the civil taxes; and
3. The administration of the two organizations were more or less fused.

It was against this type of union that the American principle of "separation" developed.

"Separation" according to the Constitution means:

1. Prohibition of the establishment of any denomination as the state religion of the country;
2. And removes from the Government the power to discriminate against persons or institutions on the grounds of religious belief.

What separation does not mean:

1. It is obvious that the first amendment did not mean that America has politically made itself an irreligious nation.

From the beginning of our history, our Nation has been motivated by the Hebrew-Christian tradition which has as its basic premise, "The Lord our God is one Lord."

The most fundamental principles of our Government have their origin in an acknowledgment of man's relation to God, and the consequent responsibility of man to man.

Democracy itself can be reduced to the basic idea of the sacredness of human life and the inherent worth of the individual.

Another basic principle of our Government is that the supreme authority in our land is moral law; that is, that right rather than might is supreme.

If we conceive of our Government as being a human institution only, we will approach the situation where the supreme authority in our Government will be in the ability of the majority to enforce its will, even to the infringement of the basic rights of minorities.

2. Separation of church and state has not been interpreted to mean that the state can be indifferent to religious practices of its people.

Though it will not trespass on religious beliefs, it has maintained a close watch that no religious group passes the boundaries of ele-

mentary Christian standards or the good of public order. So all our States demand that marriage be monogamous. A religious healer cannot practice medicine without a license. Blasphemy is forbidden.

3. Separation of church and state does not mean that the church or religion in general is made subordinate to the state.

It is assumed that a religious body is free to exist, to teach, to make converts, to carry on its acts of worship, without the approval or permission of the Congress or a department of the Government.

4. Furthermore, "separation of church and state" does not in itself place the stamp of approval upon the concept of the state as a purely secular institution, utterly removed from the sanctions of moral law and order.

In the 32d and 33d Congresses, a strong effort was made to abolish the office of chaplains in Army, Navy, and the two Houses of Congress on the ground they constituted an infringement of the principles of separation of church and state.

That effort failed.

The following is taken from the report of the committee to which the petition was referred—Report of the Committee on the Judiciary on Chaplains in Congress and in the Army and Navy; House of Representatives (33d Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 27, 1854, Doc. 124) :

Down to the revolution, every colony did sustain religion in some form. It was deemed peculiarly proper that the religion of liberty should be upheld by a free people.

Had the people, during the Revolution had a suspicion of any attempt to war against Christianity, that revolution would have been strangled in its cradle. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution and the amendments, the universal sentiment was that Christianity should be encouraged—not any sect.

Any attempt to level or discard all religion would have been viewed with universal indignation. * * *

Your committee concede that the ecclesiastical and civil powers have been, and should continue to be, entirely divorced from each other. But we beg leave to secure ourselves from the interpretation of asserting that religion is not needed to the safety of civil society. It must be considered as the foundation on which the whole structure rests. Laws will not have permanence or power without the sanction of religious sentiment—without a firm belief that there is a Power above us that will reward our virtues and punish our sins. In this age there can be no substitute for Christianity.

That, in its general principles, is a great conservative element on which we must rely for the purity and permanence of free institutions. That was the religion of the founders of the Republic, and they expected it to remain the religion of their descendants. There is a great and very prevalent error on this subject in the opinion that those who organized this Government did not legislate on it by making it free to all. * * * The error has risen from the belief that there is no legislation unless in permissive or restrictive enactments.

But making a thing free is as truly a part of legislation as confining it by limitations; and what the Government has made free, it is bound to keep free.

The Christian amendment advocates a complete separation of church and state. Each should acknowledge the Divine Authority from which each derives its being. Each should have the purpose of cooperating in furthering the best interests of all the people of the Nation.

This proposal proceeds from the concept that civil government is ordained by God—one of the three great social institutions for the welfare of men: the home, the church, and the state.

Each is separate from the other in its institution, in its authority, and in its purpose. Taken together they comprise a synthesis of divine wisdom for the entire scope of man's social life.

We believe the Christian amendment represents an attitude toward the relation of church and state which has been implicit in the traditions of American life and government since colonial days and is, therefore, justified as an effort to have it made explicit in our Federal Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions on the part of anyone here? Call your next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. Remo I. Robb.

STATEMENT OF REMO I. ROBB, MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT MOVEMENT

Mr. REMO I. ROBB. Mr. Chairman, speaking in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 87, the Christian amendment, I wish to give testimony that the Christian amendment is not a move against religious freedom and that it does not discriminate against minority groups.

Freedom of religion and the free exercise of it are an invaluable inheritance of American citizens. The voluntary and unrestricted proclamation of one's religious faith and its voluntary acceptance by others is considered to be within the limits of the "free exercise of" faith, but the imposition by law of one's religious faith upon the devotees of another faith is totally and forever un-American.

This, however, lies in the realm of private citizenship. But the Nation, this organic living America, which outlives all its citizens, has national obligations which transcend the rights of some or even all its citizens.

The Christian amendment is a proposal that the Nation, in its national life, shall acknowledge the One who is the real Author of our Nation's liberties.

The Supreme Court in its decision of the *Holy Trinity Church* case (U. S. 143) affirmed that this is a religious people; and brought forward abundant proof that the outstanding and predominant religion is Christianity. Upon Christian principles and with Christian acknowledgments this Nation was founded. Much that is highest and best in our Nation today has its roots in the Christian faith of our fathers.

And the Nation has a right, and, we believe, a duty, as a nation, to acknowledge that Christian basis in its highest law, the Constitution, which has been designated properly as "the principles by which we choose to be governed."

But while the Nation may act in a national way, it must protect the rights of particular citizens or groups of citizens who disagree at some points with the national mind. With this in mind, the Christian amendment states specifically:

SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage.

The language is clear, exact, and unmistakable. It "shall not be interpreted." How can this be a move against religious freedom, when the bill expressly and exactly states that it shall not be interpreted so? Is this merely a sop to hand to those who raise an opposing voice?

It cannot be. It is a part of the amendment and so will be a part of the law of the land. Unlike the 21st amendment which nullified the

18th amendment which preceded it, this amendment specifically re-asserts the rights guaranteed by the first amendment. The Christian amendment, by this section shows its distinct concern for the religious freedom of all our citizens.

But the oath of office requires every officer to swear to support the Constitution of the United States; therefore, it is objected that under the Christian amendment non-Christians must either become Christians before running for office or wrongly compromise their consciences in taking the oath.

Admittedly this is a problem raised by the Christian amendment, but I think it need not be an argument against it.

Every law passed anywhere has a discriminating effect upon certain citizens.

The Pennsylvania turnpike has two sets of speed laws, one for cars and one for trucks. Certain truckers may feel entitled to go as fast as cars, and some car drivers may want to go faster than the speed limit. They are discriminated against.

We are all too well acquainted with what Americans choose to call burdensome tax laws. They affect most adversely those who have to pay.

Article I, section 9, of the Constitution reads:

The importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit shall not be prohibited by Congress prior to 1808, but a tax may be imposed on such importations not to exceed \$10 per person.

That affected (1) slaveholders in territories not yet constituted as States; (2) all the States after 1808; and slaveholders who did not have \$10 per head duty.

All this was wiped out by the 13th amendment, which reads:

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to her jurisdiction.

Congress shall have power to endorse this article by appropriate legislation.

The minority surely rose up in protest about that.

What I am pointing out is that every change in the Constitution, every law based upon it, stands or falls on its good to our country, and in so doing a minority is inevitably affected. The issue constantly before the lawmakers is whether the good is more vital to our Nation than the particular minority feeling.

But what of the minority?

For the most part its feelings are ignored. "Let them go," is the common attitude.

For the speeder—it is not easy to plead the minority case to the uniformed officer who only a moment before turned off the wailing siren.

For the heavily taxed citizen—"March 15, or else!"

For the slaveholder—the sadly mishandled days of the reconstruction period in the South are a brutal commentary on forgetfulness of the minority.

Is it not the case? Every law passed anywhere has a discriminating effect on those who disagree with it. And, for most part, the feelings of that minority are entirely ignored.

But in the Christian amendment, provision is made to protect and preserve the inalienable rights of all minorities to exercise their gov-

ernmental and political obligations within the scope of their own consciences.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended.

The phrase "Congress shall have power" is used in the 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 18th, and 19th amendments to indicate that Congress is expected to legislate accordingly.

Section 3 is a distinctive application of the law propounded by Jesus Christ, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them likewise." And this application of the acknowledgment of Jesus Christ is made before the amendment bill is even finished.

No such provision for the minorities is to be found in non-Christian governments nor in so-called Christian governments with established churches.

Furthermore the Christian amendment offers safeguards to the rights of conscience of the individual as he himself views them, such as are not guaranteed in any other amendment to the Constitution.

I submit, therefore, that the Christian amendment neither acts against religious freedom nor discriminates against minority groups. Rather it upholds and safeguards all the freedoms of religion and individual conscience which Americans hold invaluable.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions to ask of this gentlemen?

Call the next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. A. J. McFarland, field secretary of the Christian Amendment Movement.

STATEMENT OF A. J. McFARLAND, FIELD SECRETARY OF THE CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT MOVEMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. I am to speak on this. The Christian amendment meets with approval wherever it has been properly explained.

Twelve years ago this September I moved to Topeka, Kans., and began doing fieldwork in behalf of a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Several years were spent in lecturing before civic groups and in churches and educational institutions. The message received almost unanimous approval wherever it was presented.

On the basis of these lectures and the contacts that have been made since it is my conviction that 75 percent of the people of America are not aware of the fact that the supreme law of this Nation makes no acknowledgment of the Supreme Being.

But it is my conviction, further, that once they are made aware of this fact they are almost 100 percent in favor of doing something about it. Many have come down the aisles with tears in their eyes, thanking us for bringing the fact of the omission of all recognition of God in our Constitution to their attention. They were both chagrined and amazed, and their universal question was, "Why has no one ever told us of this before, and why has nothing been done about it?"

Ministers would stand before their congregations after the lecture and ask, "How many in this congregation ever realized before that God and Christ are not acknowledged in the Constitution of the United States?" And often not a hand would go up. He would then turn to the speaker and say, "My good brother, I had never realized it

before, either." He would then turn and ask, "How many feel this acknowledgment should be there?" And it would appear that every hand would be raised.

He would then turn to the speaker and say, "There is your answer."

This lack of knowledge was manifest in high schools and colleges as well as churches. In one college, after the message had been given, two professors met the speaker out in the hall and said, "Well, we just went and looked up the Constitution, and you are right. There is no acknowledgment of God there."

In these colleges and high schools a show of hands was called for as to how many would favor a Christian amendment in our Constitution, and it would always appear to be unanimous.

I want to suggest, as example, three different groups, and I have in this book the names and if anyone wants to look them over, I will be happy to show them to you:

In Wichita, Kans., a lecture on the Christian amendment was given in 37 churches, representing 19 different denominations, and every minister who heard the message endorsed it.

In Topeka, Kans., the Christian amendment address was presented to 11 junior and senior high schools, and it received the written endorsement of the principals of all those schools.

In Marysville, Kans., the Christian amendment address was given before 2 civic clubs, and out of 61 men in attendance, 59 signed the amendment card, which reads as follows:

Desiring to see the Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and King of our national life, I heartily favor the following amendment to our Federal Constitution.

Then followed the amendment and a place for their name and address.

In one of these civic clubs the Catholic priest was present. After adjournment he spoke to the Presbyterian minister who introduced the speaker, and said, "Where did you ever find a man with a message like that? This is the very thing America needs."

The board of administration of the National Association of Evangelicals, representing a constituency of over 10 million people, and which includes 36 denominations, endorsed the Christian amendment at its midyear meeting in October 1951.

Personal endorsements have come from such men as the late Senator Arthur Capper, who wrote in May 1948:

I am strong for your Christian amendment resolution.

From the late Dr. Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, who said in a sermon June 29, 1947:

It is strange and, I believe, tragic, that the Constitution makes no reference to God.

From the editor of the Christian Advocate, Methodist publication, who wrote in an editorial:

We would like to see the Constitution so amended.

From Dr. M. E. Fish, dean of the Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary, who wrote:

Better have our Nation without a flag than our Constitution without Christ.

From Dr. Frederick W. Evans, former moderator of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., who wrote:

I am very much for the recognition of the crown rights of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Constitution of the United States.

The editor of *Our Sunday Visitor*, weekly newspaper of the Roman Catholic Church, wrote a front page, two-column editorial, October 1943, commending the Christian amendment.

The editor of the *Register of Denver*, sent a letter to the office of the Christian Amendment Movement, in which he said:

I can think of no Protestant movement now being pushed in the United States more worthy of the support of Catholics than yours.

The CHAIRMAN. We will make the *Sunday Visitor* part of the record.

(The document referred to was not furnished for the record concerning it. See letter below.)

OUR SUNDAY VISITOR,
Huntington, Ind., September 27, 1954.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
*Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. LANGER: I have searched through all issues of our paper printed in October in the years 1943 and 1953 and cannot find any mention made of the Christian amendment. I am therefore quite certain that Mr. McFarland was in error when he stated that something concerning the amendment was published in *Our Sunday Visitor*.

It could be that mention was made of the Christian amendment in one of the 10 diocesan editions which we publish. In that case it would be necessary to contact the individual diocesan editorial offices because we edit only the national supplement to these diocesan newspapers and do not keep a file on the diocesan sections.

Should you receive more explicit information which might help me to trace the article for you, I would be happy to cooperate.

Sincerely yours,

F. A. FINK,
Managing Editor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Many educators also have endorsed the amendment. Dr. H. L. Smith, dean emeritus of the School of Education of Indiana University, also past president of the National Education Association, endorsed the Christian amendment in these words:

It seems not only appropriate, but essential—that recognition be made in the fundamental law of the land.—King of Kings.

Dr. John Dale Russell, while director of the Division of Higher Education here in Washington, wrote as follows:

I am thoroughly familiar with the movement for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to provide suitable recognition of the supreme authority of Him who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords. I am personally most heartily in favor of the adoption of this amendment.

In a period of a few months the Christian amendment was presented in some 40 colleges and seminaries in 10 different States, which resulted in the securing of endorsements of 20 presidents and 49 other professors. These educators urged that the message be broadcast by radio.

Two of the presidents and the field secretary of the Christian amendment movement prepared a roundtable discussion of the pro-

posed amendment and in a little over a year this program was booked on 555 stations, in every State in the Union. This half-hour message received almost universal acceptance wherever it was heard. Many radio-station managers wrote commending the message and the movement, also many thousands of listeners.

Just now we are in the midst of another radio campaign with a series of 15-minute programs being broadcast each week. These are being written and produced by the best radio talent in Chicago, and though we started only this spring to secure stations, we are already on over 100 stations in 33 States.

These endorsements and the favorable reception to this message, show that when properly explained the Christian amendment does meet with approval.

Twelve years of meeting the public on this matter has convinced me that our country is ready for the adoption of this amendment. We are not to expect unanimous approval. We have lived too long away from God as a Nation to unanimously approve of the placing of Christ at the head of our Government.

"The American way" today is to classify all religions as alike, then, as far as the Government is concerned, ignore them all. It is not only freedom of religion in America, but freedom from religion.

But this cannot continue. They tried it in Italy and it brought forth Mussolini and the Fascists. They tried it in Germany and it brought forth Hitler and the Nazis. They tried it in Russia and it brought forth Stalin and the Communists.

William Penn wrote long ago: "Men will be governed by God, or they will be ruled by tyrants."

But once the people of America clearly understand what we have done in We the People taking Christ's place at the head of our Government, and once they understand how this is a definite rejection of God and of His Christ by our Nation, and leaves us liable to the visitation of His wrath, they will rise up and do something about it.

They know it is either Christ or chaos, and they will choose Christ.

Dr. M. E. Sadler, former president of the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ, said at a State convention of their church in Dallas:

We must christianize America or America will paganize us.

Our only hope is to put Christ first in our Nation and in our Government.

Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions to be asked this gentleman?

Call your next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. R. E. Robb.

STATEMENT OF R. E. ROBB, NEWSPAPER COLUMNIST, COLUMBIA, S. C.

Mr. ROBB. The subject assigned to me was the Duty of the United States of America With Respect to the Sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now, I shall present for your consideration the following main leads:

1. The government of any nation, and specifically that of the United States of America, is a moral being and has certain inescapable moral duties and responsibilities.

2. The moral principles by which this Nation should be guided are found in the tenets of the Christian religion.

3. Historically and actually this is a Christian nation.

4. This Nation does not acknowledge in its fundamental law, the Constitution, that it is a Christian nation.

5. It is the moral duty of this Nation to acknowledge formally by an amendment to the Constitution that it is founded on Christian principles.

Duty: The rod implies free moral responsibility. A rock, a plant, an animal, a machine, cannot be held responsible for a duty. Duty exists only where there is intelligence and complete freedom to make decisions of a moral nature—to decide between right and wrong. Only a moral being can be charged with a duty.

Is the state, the Government and agent of the Nation, such a moral being? Or is it, *per se*, outside the bounds of morality, with its actions governed entirely by expediency?

The answer of the great thinkers on statecraft is overwhelmingly that the state is a moral person and as such can do right, or wrong, and has certain inescapable duties.

The roster of political philosophers who have reached this decision is most impressive.

Considering only those in relatively modern times, we find Pufendorf—1632–94—defining the state as:

A moral person who ought to act just as a good man ought to act.

Similar conclusions have been expressed by Burke and Gladstone in England; Vergé and Leferrère in France; Klüber and Hegel in Germany, to mention only a few.

And in this country the number of great statesmen and philosophers who have subscribed to this conception of the nature of the state is legion—the Supreme Court repeatedly; Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, Grover Cleveland, and many, many others.

But there are some who deny all moral responsibility where government is concerned, whose only philosophy is that “might makes right,” who contend that expediency is the only rule to guide a nation.

Machiavelli was one of these. So were the Kaiser and his war lords; so was Hitler. So were the militarists of Japan; so are the men in the Kremlin.

But what fair-minded person can condone the aggressive acts of the nations led by these pragmatists? Who would say that the perfidy of the Japanese nation which climaxed in Pearl Harbor did not rank with the blackest blot on the pages of history, was not a sin of the first magnitude, was not a moral crime?

In view of the above, we maintain that every nation, and specifically the United States of America, is a moral being and, therefore, is subject to duties and responsibilities.

Since a nation is a responsible moral person there should be moral principles by which it can be guided. And these principles must of necessity be external to the state and not in any way derived from it. For, if the state should promulgate its own moral code, that code

would inevitably be grounded on and tintured by expediency. Is there such an external moral code to which this Nation and its Government can turn for guidance in making the moral decisions which constantly confront it?

The pioneers who first planted a stable government on these shores, and the greatest statesmen of the Nation ever since, have consistently and with almost complete unanimity turned to Christianity as the embodiment of that code.

The Mayflower compact, 1620, begins: "In the name of God, amen," and continues:

Having undertaken for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith, and the honor of our King and country—

et cetera.

The New England Articles of Confederation, 1643, say:

Whereas we all came into these parts of America with one and the same end and aim, namely, to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ and to enjoy the liberties of the gospel in purity and peace—

et cetera.

The Declaration of Independence, 1776, recognizes the Creator, maintains it to be the duty of the Commonwealth to withstand tyranny, and places "a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence."

The Thanksgiving proclamation of the Continental Congress, 1777, reads, in part:

For as much as it is the indispensable duty of all men to adore the superintending providence of Almighty God, to acknowledge with gratitude their obligations to Him for benefits received, and to implore such further blessings as they stand in need of * * * it is therefore recommended to the legislative powers * * * to set apart Thursday, the 18th day of December, for solemn thanksgiving and praise * * * and that they may join the penitent confession of their manifold sins * * * that it may please God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, mercifully to forgive and blot them out of remembrance—

et cetera.

Washington in his Thanksgiving proclamation, 1789, said:

That we may then all unite in tendering unto Him our sincere and humble thanks for His kind care and protection of the people of this country. * * * And also, that we may then unite in offering our Lord and Ruler of Nations—

et cetera.

President Lincoln in the black days of the Civil War proclaimed a day of fasting and prayer with the words:

Whereas the Senate of the United States, devoutly recognizing the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and nations. * * * And whereas it is the duty of nations, as well as of men, to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God * * * and to recognize the sublime truth announced in Holy Scriptures, and proven by all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord * * * I do * * * set apart Thursday, the 30th day of April 1863 as a day of national humiliation, fasting, and prayer.

This shows, I believe, that the war became changed shortly after that date.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, in a great many States governors have declared a day of prayer.

Mr. ROBB. Yes.

And Mr. Justice Brewer in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of *Holy Trinity Church v. The United States*, said: "This is a religious people."

After citing numerous historical instances bearing on the subject, including those mentioned above, he summed it up with:

These and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian Nation.

When there are added to all of the above evidence the further facts that everyone of the Original Thirteen Colonies recognized the authority of God in its charter and that the great majority of our States also make such acknowledgment in greater or less degree in their constitutions, we are warranted in stating categorically that this is in fact basically and fundamentally a Christian nation.

But the Nation itself does not say so. Its official spokesman, its written or enacted Constitution, is silent on the subject.

It should be noted that there are in all nations two constitutions, the one unwritten and vital; the other written or enacted. Historically the vital always comes first for "constitutional law is, and can only be, the development or sanction of an unwritten preexisting right."

Again:

No written constitution can exist a priori or have an a priori authority. There must have been an existing sovereignty to originate such a constitution.

Specifically:

The Constitution of the United States is twofold, written and unwritten; the Constitution of the people, and the Constitution of the Government. The written Constitution is simply a law ordained by the Nation or people instituting and organizing the Government; the unwritten constitution is the real or actual constitution of the people as a State or sovereign community, and constituting them such or such a state. It is providential, not made by a nation, but born with it. The written Constitution is made and ordained by the sovereign power, and presupposes that power is already existing and constituted.

That is the crux to this whole argument right here, that "The formal Constitution must correspond to the real."

Further:

The formal Constitution must correspond to the real. There can be no sacredness attaching to the abstract form; and neither devotion nor sacrifice for the Constitution when it is regarded only as an abstract formula; it is sacred only insofar as it is affirmative of the law which is implicit in the Nation.

We have previously demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt that the vital, the actual Constitution of this Nation is and always has been Christian, from the first settlers down to the present. But the written Constitution, which should accurately reflect the vital Constitution, is sadly lacking in respect to its acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as the Supreme Ruler and His law as the supreme authority of the Nation.

Instead, the preamble, the enabling clause of the Constitution, reads:

We the people of the United States * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The changeable will of the people is the supreme authority recognized.

We submit that this Nation now, this Congress, this session of Congress, has a duty to perform. It should at once initiate proceedings to make the written Constitution a true reflection of the actual Constitution. This is a duty to America—past, present, and future—

to our neighboring states throughout the world, and to Almighty God.

The pioneers who carved this Nation out of the wilderness bequeathed to us a new conception of liberty—a priceless heritage which has made this Nation the wonder of history and the envy of all mankind. We of this generation owe it to our fathers, who founded this Nation on the rock Christ Jesus, to keep good faith with them and to pass on our heritage unencumbered.

At the present time the forces of evil are marshaled under the banner of communism in a manner and to a degree such as history has never seen. It looks as though this generation might have to bear the brunt of the cataclysmic and final battle between good and evil, between Christ and Satan.

It behooves us, under such circumstances, humbly to call upon the Lord God Omnipotent, and upon His Son, the Creator and Lord of the universe, for aid and succor.

For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of the world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.

And to the future, to the unborn generations which will follow us, it is our duty to leave this Nation strong as only God can make it. Then they will be able to go forward, triumphing over physical, social, and spiritual obstacles so that this Nation will approach ever more closely to the absolute of perfection, which must be its constant goal.

But our duty is not merely to ourselves; it extends to the world at large. On this new continent, as in Palestine of old, there is being worked out an experiment. We of America are the new chosen people, placed in a promised land rich beyond conception, and guarded, not by mere mountains and deserts, but by vast oceans. Here, under the protection of Almighty God, we have been given an opportunity to work out a new political ideology. If we succeed we can lead the world into a better and finer way of life. But if we fail, civilization as we know it will almost certainly crash us in ruins.

And, finally, we have a duty to God. A few passages from His word will make that duty clear. God is the author of all national life:

All nations whom Thou hast made shall come and worship before Thee, O Lord, and shall glorify Thy name (Psalms 86: 9).

It is God's prerogative to take away national life:

At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation * * * to pluck up and to pull down, and to destroy it * * * (Jeremiah 18: 7).

Civil rulers are ministers of God, deriving all just authority ultimately from Him:

By me [Christ Jesus] kings reign and princes decree justice (Proverbs 8: 15).
For he [the civil magistrate] is the minister of God to thee for good (Romans 13: 4).

Civil rulers are enjoined to learn Christ's law, and acknowledge and obey Him as king:

Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him (Psalms 2: 10).

We have shown that this Nation is a moral being, that historically, philosophically, and by numerous decisions of the Supreme Court this

Nation is a Christian nation; that the written Constitution is not in accord with the vital, actual providential Constitution which alone gives the written Constitution validity, and that the Nation has a duty to discharge—to itself, to the rest of the world, and to Almighty God.

We believe in our deepest being that an amendment to the written Constitution, which is the authoritative voice of the Nation, is necessary to correct this condition and to place the Government of this Nation on a solid footing.

We accordingly are most heartily in favor of House Joint Resolution 289, in the House of Representatives, proposing the following as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

SECTION 1. This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and ruler of nations, through who are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.

SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization; or in the abridgement of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended.

We submit that with this amendment to the Constitution, or its equivalent, this Nation will have kept faith with itself, with its founders and with its Creator.

And, instead of resting on the shifting sands of human expediency, its foundation will be the solid bedrock of immutable truth.

For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. And the government shall be upon his shoulders.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Are there any questions of this witness?

Call the next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. R. J. G. McKnight.

STATEMENT OF R. J. G. McKNIGHT, PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. McKNIGHT. I did not know what subject would be assigned to me until I came here so, Mr. Stenographer, I am speaking off the cuff.

If I were to state the topic assigned to me we would call it the advantage of a Christian amendment to the Jewish people.

I am not an anti-Semitic as everybody ought to know who knows me. Not everybody knows me. I have taught Hebrew for 30 years consecutively in one institution. I have studied the Old Testament as best I could. I have studied with the best of rabbis, and I like the Jewish people. I have many, many friends among them.

Harry Houdini was one of my best friends until he died. I lived in his home for a while. I wrote a book for Harry Houdini. That was *The Faith Against the Spiritualists*, and when they claimed the transfiguration as a seance in which Christ was able to materialize Himself, I said to Houdini, who was a Jew, rabbi, and I first knew him when we sat down in the old theater in Pittsburgh together with an open Hebrew Bible and read an act of the *Witch of Endor*—that is how I happened to know him; I traveled with him quite a while after that. Now when it came to that question I said, "Houdini, you

are a Jew; you do not believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God." He said, "McKnight, I believe that if the Eternal God wanted to incarnate himself in human flesh he could do that."

That is as near as I came to having an expression from him.

Now we expected a good many people would object to such an amendment as this here proposed. All atheists would object to this. Of course they would. There is no arguing against atheists because there is no use arguing with a fool and the Bible has said that a fool says in his heart "No God." There is no use arguing with that.

I am sorry that my Jewish friends, although they have not objected here in my hearing, will object to this amendment that is proposed.

Now it is very, very well stated. I wish this were passed. It would give me more than my Jewish friends are asking.

This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage.

Now that is pretty plain. That is pretty good. Here is where it is of advantage to the Jews and to me if it were passed.

Congress shall have the power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended.

That is, if it mentions Jesus Christ in there, then there will be an oath provided which would relieve the conscience of the Jew.

Now as for me today, if I have to take an oath to the Constitution of the United States, I take it without qualification, I have to take it without qualification. But there is a way provided.

Now it has been proved abundantly here in all these documents—while it would be worthwhile repeating, it is not in place to repeat anything that has been said, but I am sure my good friend, the rabbi—I wish I knew him better, he has a little smile, he is a little like Harry Houdini himself—but I am sure he knows I am citing the 33d chapter, the 22d verse, "For the Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King; He will save us."

And he knows that his nation began as a bureaucracy at the foot of Sinai and it continued until the monarchy and then it went down until after Babylon.

When Jesus Christ came into the world there was no Jewish king. There were little kinglets, but no Jewish king. And they rejected their King.

I am speaking from my point of view—they rejected their King. They stood in the judgment hall of Pilate and they said, "We have no king but Caesar."

You know, God usually gives people what they want. God gave the Jewish people Caesars, kaisers, czars; it is all the same thing. They suffered horribly.

Jesus Christ said, going away from the temple, "Look at the beautiful temple, the stones are together." He said, "There will not be one left on another," and a million Jews died in the city of Jerusalem.

Down through the centuries, the Jew has been a man without a nation and without a country. Now I believe that that comes from the rejection of Jesus Christ.

I am not here as an evangelist to convert any Jew, but I do say that this Christianity that we talk about here is in the very fiber of our Nation. Those people that crossed the seas, those Covenanters,

Huguenots, and Pilgrims, came across the seas, they believed that the Lord Jesus Christ was King. It was woven into the warp and woof of our national life altogether, regardless of the Constitution and Chief Justice Storey says in his commentary on the Constitution that up to the time of the Revolution, there was no argument about it. All these colonial compacts began in the name of the Lord, Amen, and they acknowledged the Lord Jesus Christ as King and they came here to escape persecution.

Now the Jews have progressed, the Jews have prospered in Christian land. That is where they have prospered. That is where they are prospering today under the shadow of that flag which stands for liberty, and that would not stand for liberty if it were not for the Christian religion which is back of it.

I say if you take Christianity out of our national life you cut the taproot of not only religion, you cut the taproot of civilization.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish that the Congress would go on to pass this. I think it is vital to all of us. You may think that we are a little handful here today, and we are, and a lot of folks may be back of this petition for this amendment to the Constitution of the United States. But I want to say to you that when you talk about truth, it does not matter how many or how few are around this table, truth is something that will live, something that will endure, and that will some day triumph.

Now I am sorry to have imposed upon your time for so long.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not imposing on anybody. That is what we are here for. You can stay as long as you want to and talk for as long as you want to.

Are there any questions?

Call your next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. G. M. Robb.

STATEMENT OF G. M. ROBB, FORMER LECTURER OF THE CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT MOVEMENT

Mr. ROBB. Mr. Chairman, in our Government there are many acts and customs which are, in themselves, divine acknowledgments. The sessions of the Senate and of the House of Representatives are opened with prayer by the chaplains, who often invoke God's favor and blessing "through Jesus Christ our Lord." Our coins bear the motto "In God we trust."

The President of the United States issues an annual Thanksgiving proclamation. The ceremony of inauguration of the President of the United States into office, opens and closes with prayer. In our civil courts the oath is taken with the words, "So help me God." These religious moments are not distinct church services, not sectarian affairs, but are a part of our national life.

Therefore it might be asked, "Since we have these evidences of faith in our national life, why suggest that a divine acknowledgment be written into the Constitution?"

Once upon a time the same question came up, with respect to our Bill of Rights. The rights and principles and beliefs set forth in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution were in the thoughts of men and in the practices of men before they became a part of the Constitution. But, in order to preserve them, it was deemed essential that

they be written into the Constitution by a clear and intentional statement by the Government through its orderly processes.

For a time, the omission of a divine acknowledgment from our Federal Constitution set the pattern for the State constitutions that were being framed. A large number of the new State constitutions of the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century, contained no divine acknowledgment whatever. After a time the trend was reversed; and into more and more new constitutions there appeared divine acknowledgments in one form or another—until at the present time, 43 of the States have some form of divine acknowledgment written into their State constitutions. This indicates change in our thinking concerning the proper recognition of God in written constitutions.

However, the States are smaller political units, and constitutional changes, of whatever nature, come much more easily and much more rapidly in the State governments, than in the Federal Government.

The Federal Constitution needs its divine acknowledgment. More and more in our national life we are feeling the void that is left by the silence of the Constitution regarding this matter. In recent years Supreme Court decisions on matters having to do with religion, have not followed a consistent pattern. In a recent case which reached the Supreme Court, Mrs. Vashti McCollum petitioned that the Board of Education of Champaign, Ill., be ordered to adopt and enforce rules and regulations prohibiting all instruction in, and all teaching of, all religious education in all public schools in the Champaign district.

In connection with that case, Mr. Justice Jackson stated:

It is idle to pretend that this task is one for which we can find in the Constitution one word to help us as judges to decide where the secular ends and the sectarian begins in education. Now can we find it in any other legal source? It is a matter on which we can find no law but our own presuppositions.

Mr. Justice William Strong of the United States Supreme Court, stated in 1871.

It is a serious matter if the Constitution should be found wanting in any principle or matter of fact. The deficiency will in due time work mischief. Error in the Constitution will work as powerfully as truth, and what is left out of it may one day be formally declared un-American.

He went on to say:

All the laws of this country in favor of a Christian morality are enacted and enforced outside of the Constitution. They rest only upon the basis of what is called common law. As matters seem to be going, it will soon be discovered and decreed that common law is only another name for custom, which has no binding force.

The Constitution needs a divine acknowledgment written into it, so that such acknowledgment may serve as a standard by which to judge those laws that safeguard our society, and by which to preserve that religious attitude of our Government which is now expressed in many outward acts and customs.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Call the next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. D. H. Elliott.

STATEMENT OF D. H. ELLIOTT, MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION

Mr. ELLIOTT. Senator Langer, I wish to file with your committee the manuscript that I have here. I am not going to read it. A good many things have been said that I refer to here, so I am going to make this short. Our time is fast flying away this afternoon.

Mr. Robb made mention of a number of these documents and I will try not to duplicate it or anything that he said or that anybody else said.

He mentioned the compact made on board the *Mayflower* that begins, "In the name of God, amen," and so forth.

Then there is the Charter of Virginia, such phrases in it as "the providence of Almighty God," "the glory of the divine majesty," and the "propagation of the Christian religion," and so forth.

The Charter of Maryland, and I am just giving phrases out of it, closes with the statement that no interpretation of its provisions should be allowed to interfere with God's hold and true Christian religion.

The Charter of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, contains the phrase:

to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God, and savior of mankind, and the Christian faith.

The Charter for the Colony of Rhode Island speaks of defending themselves, "against enemies of the Christian faith."

Then we have the colonial compacts. The Rhode Island compact states:

We whose names are underwritten, do hereby solemnly, in the presence of Jehova, incorporate ourselves into a body politic; and as He shall help, will submit our persons, lives and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

The preamble of the Colony of Connecticut speaks of "Almighty God by the wise disposition of His divine providence" and "the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ."

The New Hampshire compact begins:

We do, in the name of Christ and in the sight of God, combine ourselves together to erect and set up among us such government as shall be, to our best discerning, agreeable to the will of God, and binding of ourselves solemnly by the grace and help of Christ.

There is much more to it.

Now I think this is interesting. Then the oath under this compact was administered in the—

great and dreadful name of the high God, maker and governor of heaven and earth, and by the Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of the kings and rulers of the earth.

Then we might go on to the individual colonies. We will pass over those. Here are the Articles of Confederation, this sentence:

Whereas we all came into these parts of America with one and the same end, namely, to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to enjoy the liberties of the Gospel in purity and peace.

So it goes. I will not take time to go into the colonial laws. These are along the same line.

Here is the great law of Pennsylvania. It begins with: "Whereas the glory of Almighty God" and so on—

To make and establish such laws as shall best preserve true Christian and civil liberty in opposition to all unchristian, licentious, and unjust practices— and so forth.

The Congress of the Confederate States passed a wonderful resolution. I will not read that.

The Presidential proclamation we have heard about, the one of George Washington. I do not think the one of John Adams was mentioned. I do want to mention this about John Adams.

John Adams closed his inaugural message with this prayer:

And may that Being who is supreme over all, the Patron of Order, the Fountain of Justice, and the Protector, in all ages of the world, of virtuous liberty, continue His blessing upon this Nation and its Government, and give it all possible success and duration consistent with the ends of His providence.

Here is something that I do want to bring in. The son of John Adams, John Quincy Adams, in his Presidential address spoke of "being fully convinced that the neglect to recognize the law of God of all human legislation is the frontal source of these evils." He says:

We therefore pray you, as our representatives, to recommend to the people of the United States an alteration to the Constitution, embracing the following amendments—

Now we are here today, on the very same thing started back there in connection with John Quincy Adams. Here is what he recommended:

1. A clear and explicit acknowledgment of the Sovereign of the universe, as the God of this Nation.
2. An entire and avowed submission to the Lord Jesus Christ, His anointed (Psalm 2: 7), who is the Prince of the kings of the earth (Rev. 1: 5), the Head of all principalities and powers (Col. 2: 10), as ruler of this Nation.
3. An unreserved reception of His revealed will, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the law paramount, by which all the conflicting State laws being regarded as perfectly null and void.

Then he quotes the Scriptures:

Be wise, now, therefore, O ye kings. Also (Psalm 19: 7) The law of the Lord is perfect, and so forth. (10)

The reasons which John Quincy Adams gave for the adopting of a Christian amendment are still worth heeding. Though the proposal was laid on the table, it continues, in various verbiage, to rise again.

Nothing has been said about Abraham Lincoln. We are all familiar with the history of his many statements. We will pass over that.

It is significant that 42 of the 48 States have some recognition of a Divine Being.

The CHAIRMAN. The previous speaker said 43. You say 42.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Forty-two, I think. Anyhow, the great majority of the States have some kind of acknowledgment. It is not all in the form we have here, but they recognize a Divine Being.

So this is what I would like to file with you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be filed.

(The statement referred to follows:)

PRECEDENTS IN COLONIAL DOCUMENTS AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS

(By Delber H. Elliott)

Mr. Chairman, I present herewith certain documentary evidence showing that the proposed Christian amendment is in harmony with the early history of America. This data is gleaned from various colonial charters, compacts, congressional actions, State constitutions, and Presidential proclamations. These reveal that our early history is distinctly Christian. We cite only a few from a multitude of historical statements in support of our thesis.

The compact made on board the *Mayflower*, dated November 11, 1620, begins as follows: "In the name of God, amen. * * * Having undertaken for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith * * * do by these presents solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid."

The colonial charters of Virginia, Massachusetts Bay, Maryland, Connecticut, Carolina, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Georgia are based upon the Christian religion.

The first charter of Virginia, dated April 10, 1606, makes reference to "the providence of Almighty God," "the glory of the divine majesty," and the "propagating of the Christian religion." The second charter for the government of Virginia (May 23, 1609) declares that the inhabitants should "determine to live together in the fear and true worship of Almighty God, Christian peace, and civil quietness." (1)

The charter of Maryland (June 20, 1632) closes with the statement that no interpretation of its provisions should be allowed to interfere with God's holy and true Christian religion. (2)

The charter for the Colony of Massachusetts Bay (March 4, 1644) contains the phrase: "To the knowledge and obedience of the only true God, and Savior of mankind, and the Christian faith." (3)

The charter for the Colony of Rhode Island guaranteed religious freedom to all with the right to defend themselves "against enemies of the Christian faith." This charter is an eloquent example of a true Christian commonwealth of liberty protected by righteous law.

We now pass to the colonial compacts.

The Rhode Island compacts were based on Christian principles. The settlers in 1638 subscribed to the following compact of government: "We whose names are underwritten, do hereby solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah, incorporate ourselves into a body politic; and as He shall help, will submit our persons, lives, and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, and to all those perfect and absolute laws of His, given us in His holy word of truth, to be judged and guided thereby." (4)

The Colony of Connecticut (January 14, 1639) adopted this preamble to their constitution of government: "Forasmuch as it has pleased the Almighty God by the wise disposition of His divine providence as to order and dispose of things that we * * * enter into combination and federation together to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, which we now profess; as also the discipline of the church of Christ, according to the truth of said Gospel as now preached amongst us, as also in civil affairs to be guided and governed according to such laws, orders, and decrees as shall be made, ordered, and decreed." (5)

The compact entered into in New Hampshire on August 4, 1639, included the following: "We * * * do, in the name of Christ and in the sight of God, combine ourselves together to erect and set up among us such government as shall be, to our best discerning, agreeable to the will of God, * * * and binding of ourselves solemnly by the grace and help of Christ, and in His name and fear, to submit ourselves to such godly and Christian laws as are established in the realm of England, to our best knowledge, and to all other such laws, which shall upon good grounds be made and enacted among us according to God, that we may live quietly and peaceably together in all godliness and honesty." (6)

The oath under this compact was administered in the "great and dreadful name of the high God, Maker and Governor of heaven and earth, and by the Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of the kings and rulers of the earth."

Not only were these Christian acknowledgments made by individual colonies, but the early movements for Federal unity made similar recognition of the Divine Being. The United Colonies of New England were a miniature production of the United States of America. As the Articles of Confederation bound together the Colonies, so the Federal Constitution binds together the several States.

We quote from these Articles of Confederation the following: "Whereas we all came into these parts of America with one and the same end, namely, to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to enjoy the liberties of the Gospel in purity and peace."

What we are seeking is a similar acknowledgment in the Constitution of the United States.

We cannot here take the time to point out that the early colonial laws are as replete with Christian acknowledgments as are the colonial compacts and charters from which we have taken these quotations.

An extract from the Great Law of Pennsylvania will illustrate what we mean. From its preamble we quote the following: "Whereas the glory of Almighty God, and the good of mankind, is the reason and end of government, and therefore government itself is a veritable ordinance of God; and for as much as it is principally desired and intended by the proprietary and Governor * * * to make and establish such laws as shall best preserve true Christian and civil liberty in opposition to all un-Christian, licentious, and unjust practices, whereby God may have His due, Caesar his due, and the people their due, from tyranny and oppression of the one side, and insolvency and licentiousness of the other, so that the best and firmest foundation may be laid for the present and future happiness of both the Governor and people of this province and territories aforesaid * * *" (7).

In accord with these divine acknowledgments, laws were consistently enacted against blasphemy, vice, and immorality and other great evils which threatened the well-being of their Commonwealth.

On October 12, 1778, the Congress of the Confederate States passed this resolution: "Whereas true religion and good morals are the only solid foundations of public liberty and happiness:

Resolved, That it be and it is hereby earnestly recommended to the several States to take the most effectual measures for the encouragement thereof, and for the suppressing theatrical entertainments, horse racing, gaming, and such other diversions as are productive of idleness, dissipation, and a general depravity of principles and manners."

In accord with all of this, congressional and Presidential proclamations followed the same religious trend and custom; George Washington, in his first inaugural address, said:

"In this first official act, I offer my fervent supplication to that Almighty Being who rules over our universe * * * who presides in the councils of the nations, and whose providential aid can supply every human defect. * * * In tendering this homage to the Great Author of every public and private good, I assure myself that it expresses our sentiments, no less than my own. * * * No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States. Every step by which we have advanced * * * seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency."

At the close of his special recommendations, Washington concluded by saying:

"I now take my present leave from you * * * but not without turning once more to the benign parent of the human race, in humble supplication that He and His divine blessing may temper our measures upon which the success of this Government must depend." (8)

John Adams closed his inaugural message with this prayer: "And may that Being who is supreme over all, the Patron of order, the Fountain of justice, and the Protector, in all ages of the world, of virtuous liberty, continue His blessing upon this Nation and its Government, and give it all possible success and duration consistent with the ends of His providence."

President John Adams also issued one of the greatest of our state documents revealing the character of a Christian democracy in calling for a national day of prayer (March 6, 1799). It begins with these words: "As no truth is more clearly, taught in the Volume of Inspiration, nor any more fully demonstrated by the experience of all ages, than that a deep sense and a due acknowledgement of the governing providence of a Supreme Being, and of the accountableness of man to Him as the searcher of hearts and righteous distributor of rewards and punishments, are conducive equally to the happiness and rectitude of individuals and to the well-being of communities: * * *

"* * * I do hereby recommend * * * that Thursday, the 25th day of April next, be observed throughout the United States of America as a day of solemn humiliation, fasting and prayer; that the citizens of that day abstain, as far as may be, from their secular occupation, and devote the time to the sacred duties of religion, in public and in private; that they call to mind our numerous offenses against the most high God, confess them before Him with the sincerest penitence, implore His pardoning mercy, through the Great Mediator and Redeemer, for our past transgressions, and that, through the grace of His Holy Spirit, we may be disposed and enabled to yield a more suitable obedience to His righteous requisitions in time to come; that He would arrest the progress of that impiety and licentiousness in principle and practice so offensive to himself and so ruinous to mankind; that He would make us deeply sensible that 'Righteousness exalteth a nation, but that sin is a reproach to any people.'" (9)

The rest of the document is equally impressive.

It is of supreme interest that John Quincy Adams, son of John Adams became the sixth President of the United States in 1825. Following his term of presidential office he was reelected continuously to eight successive Congresses until his death. While serving as Congressman he did, on February 19, 1844, present the following resolution:

"We, the undersigned, being of western Pennsylvania and Ohio, and having with deep anxiety and painful emotions observed the distractions and alienations which are so alarmingly prevalent * * * and being fully convinced that the neglect to recognize the law of God of all human legislation is the frontal source of these evils * * *

"We therefore pray you, as our representatives, to recommend to the people of the United States an alteration to the Constitution, embracing the following amendments:

"1. A clear and explicit acknowledgment of the Sovereign of the universe, as the God of this Nation.

"2. An entire and avowed submission to the Lord Jesus Christ, His anointed (Psalm 2: 7), who is the Prince of the kings of the earth (Revelation 1: 5), the Head of all principalities and powers (Colossians 2: 10), as ruler of this Nation.

"3. An unreserved reception of His revealed will, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the law paramount, by which all the conflicting state laws being regarded as perfectly null and void. (Psalm 2: 10, 12) 'Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings.' Also (Psalm 19: 7) 'The law of the Lord is perfect, etc.'" (10)

The reasons which John Quincy Adams gave for the adopting of a Christian amendment are still worth heeding. Thought the proposal was laid on the table, it continues, in various verbiage, to rise again.

Abraham Lincoln's proclamations and national calls for prayer and repentance are in line with all this early Christian history. During the dark days of the Civil War a committee of 21 farsighted citizens was sent to the White House to petition President Lincoln's support in behalf of an acknowledgment of the rights of God in the Constitution. His reply, reported then, was, "Gentlemen, you have come here on a great errand. We are going through a terrible war to secure the rights of men. The next step will be to acknowledge the rights of God. And I, as soon as I see my way clear, will recommend the same to Congress."

In closing we turn briefly to Christian acknowledgments found in constitutions of the several States. Of the 48 States, 42 have made some reference to the Divine Being. The Thirteen Original States all contained explicit acknowledgements of God with the exception of Virginia. In a later revision Virginia inserted in its preamble the words: "Invoking the favor and guidance of Almighty God."

Of the present State constitutions, seven make reference to "Almighty God." These are New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, North Carolina, Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee. Those mentioning "God" are Maryland, South Carolina, New Hampshire, and Georgia. Massachusetts speaks of "the Great Legislator of the Universe"; Pennsylvania of "the Author of Existence," and "the Great Sovereign of the Universe." (11)

An analysis of State constitutions shows that before 1840, nine made acknowledgement of God. Before 1866 there were 26 which made such acknowledgment. Following 1866 only five failed to acknowledge a higher power.

Expressions found in the constitutions of the States include the following: God, Almighty God, Sovereign Ruler, Great Legislator, Supreme Being, Sovereign Ruler of Nations, Supreme Ruler of the Universe, Creator and Preserver of the Universe, and Author of the Universe.

We conclude that the principle of acknowledging God in constitutional law is firmly established in American history, from its very inception. It is demonstrated in the early charters, compacts; congressional actions, Presidential proclamations, and State constitutions.

Our earnest appeal therefore is that our Federal Constitution be brought into harmony with the historic position held by our Nation from the beginning, namely:

That God is the source of the Nation's life.

That Jesus Christ is God's highest sovereign over nations.

That the Holy Scriptures is God's revealed will to nations.

That nations should acknowledge in their fundamental law the supreme authority of Him who gave them their being.

REFERENCES

- (1) Henning's Statutes at Large (vol. 1, pp. 95, 98).
- (2) Maxcy's Laws of Maryland (vol. 1, pp. 1, 10).
- (3) Almon's Charters (p. 63).
- (4) American State Papers, compiled by Rev. William Jackson (pp. 101-103).
- (5) Hinman's Antiquities (p. 20).
- (6) Belnap's History of New Hampshire (pp. 432, 433).
- (7) McAllister's Manual of Civil Government (pp. 60-65).
- (8) McAllister's Manual of Civil Government (pp. 76 ff.).
- (9) McAllister's Manual of Civil Government (p. 79).
- (10) The Presbyterian, March 23, 1944.
- (11) Federal and State Constitutions, Thorpe (7 vols).

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions of the gentleman here? Call the next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. T. C. McKnight.

STATEMENT OF T. C. McKNIGHT, PRESIDENT OF THE CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT MOVEMENT

Mr. McKNIGHT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is T. C. McKnight, and I represent the Christian Amendment Movement as president of the organization. I wish to speak on the divine requirement for nations as set forth in the word of God, favoring the Christian amendment Senate Joint Resolution 87.

Since the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God and the revelation of His will as the moral governor of this world, we are under obligation to accept His laws as authoritative in every department of human life. The Bible would not be the perfect and adequate revelation of the will of God to our race, if it did not give us the principles of conduct in so important a department of human life as that of the state. As a matter of fact, a large part of the Bible deals with the principles of political science.

I wish now to set forth before the committee some of the outstanding scriptural teachings as to the origin and nature of the nation.

1. God is the author of all national life.

Deuteronomy 26:19:

To make thee high above all nations which He hath made.

Psalms 86:9:

All nations whom Thou hast made shall come and worship before Thee, O Lord, and shall glorify Thy name.

Acts 17:24-26:

God that made the world and all things therein * * * hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth.

2. God brings each particular nation into existence in its own time in the progress of the world's history, and appoints unto each nation its own rightful territory.

Acts 17:26:

And hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.

3. The nation, a being which God creates, and which he rewards for its righteousness, or destroys for its sins, is a moral being to which God has given supreme moral law.

Deuteronomy 8:1:

All the commandments which I command thee this day shall ye observe to do, that ye may live, and multiply, and go in and possess the land which the Lord swore unto your fathers.

4. Civil government, the institution for the regulation and control of national life, is in its principle the ordinance of God, and is to be obeyed as such a divine ordinance.

Romans 13:1, 2:

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.

Gathering up the above teachings of the Old and New Testaments, applying alike to the nation of the Jews and to the gentile nations, we have what Christian political science teaches in reference to the origin and nature of the nation. It is a moral being, born into the family of nations, in the providence of God.

The above passages also show conclusively that civil government is a divine ordinance, and that the state as an institution is founded in the nature of man. When God made man he made him a social being, with the principles of the family and the state in his nature.

Hence, just as the legal person, such as a corporation, deriving its corporate existence from the state is bound to acknowledge in its charter the political power which gives it existence, so the nation, which derives its being from God, and its authority from that ultimate and divine source, is bound to acknowledge in its charter or fundamental law, such as our Constitution, the author of its being and source of its authority.

In the second place, the Scriptures also teach that Christ is ruler of nations.

1. Jesus Christ, as mediator, has all power and universal dominion committed to Him, which must include authority over nations.

Matthew 28:18:

And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

John 5:22, 23:

The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father which hath sent Him.

Philippians 2:9-11:

God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

2. Christ actually rules as King of nations, whether they acknowledge Him or not, by punishing them for their violations of His law, or rewarding them for their obedience.

Psalms 2: 1-5, 9, 12:

Why do the nations rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against His Anointed (literally, His Messiah, or His Christ), saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall He speak unto them in His wrath, and vex them in His sore displeasure. * * * Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel * * * Blessed are all they (all nations and their rulers, as is clear from the preceding verses) that put their trust in Him (in the Son, the Messiah, or Christ).

Revelation 19: 11-15:

In righteousness He doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns. * * * And He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and His name is called the Word of God. * * * And out of His mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it He should smite the nations; and He shall rule them with a rod of iron; and He treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.

3. The Scriptures foretell the day when all nations shall acknowledge and obey Christ as their Ruler, and shall be blessed under His glorious reign.

Psalms 22: 27:

All the end of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.

Psalms 72: 8, 11, 17:

He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth * * * Yea, all kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him * * * His name shall endure forever; His name shall be continued as long as the sun; and men shall be blessed in Him; all nations shall call him blessed.

Revelation 11: 15:

And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign forever and ever.

There is a precedent in our own national history setting forth the substance of these teachings as to the relation of the Nation to Christ, in the resolution of the United States Senate passed in 1863 requesting President Lincoln to appoint a day of fasting and prayer. That resolution is as follows—keep in mind this is an act of the Senate:

Resolved, That devoutly recognizing the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and of nations, and sincerely believing that no people, however great in numbers and resources, or however strong in the justice of their cause, can prosper without His favor, and at the same time deploring the national offenses which have provoked His righteous judgment, yet encouraged in this day of trouble by the assurances of His Word, to seek Him for succor according to His appointed way, through Jesus Christ, the Senate of the United States do hereby request the President of the United States, by his proclamation, to designate and set apart a day for national prayer and humiliation, requesting all the people of the land to suspend their secular pursuits, and unite in keeping the day in solemn communion with the Lord of Hosts, supplicating Him to enlighten the councils and direct the policy of the rulers of the Nation, and to support all our soldiers, sailors, and marines, and the whole people, in the firm discharge of duty until the existing rebellion shall be overthrown and the blessings of peace restored to our bleeding country.

This resolution of the United States Senate either directly acknowledges or clearly implies the following points:

1. Christ's rulership over nations;
2. The punishments that justly come by violation of His law;
3. The reward of national obedience to His authority; and
4. The way of pardon through Him, by confession and reformation.

The Christian forces of America will be satisfied with no aim short of the honor due to the royal person, Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords, whose name is above every name.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very fine statement, Mr. McKnight.

Are there any questions that anyone wishes to ask the witness? Call your next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. J. Renwick Patterson.

STATEMENT OF J. RENWICK PATTERSON, D. D., EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee, my name is J. Renwick Patterson. I am the executive secretary of the National Reform Association, a nondenominational, non-sectarian Christian citizenship organization founded in 1863 for the purpose of maintaining and strengthening the Christian features in our national and governmental life, and for promoting needed reforms in the life of the Nation.

I am here today as a representative of this association to urge you to act favorably on this bill, Senate Joint Resolution 87, to recognize the law and authority of Jesus Christ in the Constitution of the United States and thus provide a secure legal basis for the Christian laws and customs which are part and parcel of American life.

How deeply the spiritual has been woven into the fabric of American life is abundantly revealed in our American history and tradition. Our historical acts and political documents bear undeniable testimony to the fact that we are a religious people. The religious aspects of our history are matters of truth which cannot be denied.

The Supreme Court of the United States declared, through Justice Brewer in reversing the decision of the circuit court in the case of Holy Trinity Church versus the United States, "This is a Christian nation." The Court laid strong emphasis upon the fact that Christianity is part of the common law of the land. This common or unwritten law consists of those customs and practices that have grown up with us as a nation.

This Nation was founded by Christian people and, because of this, Christian customs have been observed from our Nation's infancy, and such customs continue to be observed. The fact that Christianity is part of the common or unwritten law of the land does not in any sense or degree rest upon or rise from any union of church and state. It rises from and rests solely upon the fact that the people—that is, the great mass of the people—are Christian. This has ever been true in our Nation. Since it is true it follows in a very natural way that there are Christian principles and usages that must and do find their proper expression in the life of the Nation and in its Government.

In evidence of the Christian emphasis that is to be found in our political documents and compacts, both in our colonial history and that of later time, I merely call your attention to the Mayflower Com-

pact, the Rhode Island Charter, the Great Law of Pennsylvania, the Declaration of Independence, the North West Ordinance, and the acknowledgments of God to be found in the preambles or the bill of rights of 47 of our 48 States.

I mention 47 there because I have included in there such States as make some recognition of the rights of man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience in the Bill of Rights.

Seldom do men comment on any of these documents without calling special attention to their Christian features, their divine acknowledgments, as the secret of their strength.

But the Christian elements are found not only in political documents, but in governmental provisions and practices as well. We have prayers in Congress offered almost invariably in the name of Christ, our Lord. To this end we have Chaplains in each House with salaries paid from the National Treasury. We have chaplains in the armed services similarly paid. We have a religious service in connection with the inauguration. We have the Bible in many of our public schools. We have the motto "In God We Trust" on our coins and on some of our postage stamps. We exempt churches from taxation. We have some recognition of the Lord's day. We have action pending to place the words "under God" in our pledge of allegiance to the flag.

The CHAIRMAN. I might inform you that this committee has already passed it. And the Senate has passed it. It is over in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PATTERSON. Good.

All of these things testify to the place Christianity had had in the past and continues to have in our national life.

But when it comes to our Constitution, our fundamental law, there is complete silence regarding God. He isn't even mentioned. There is no recognition, no acknowledgment. In our Constitution there is absolutely nothing to undergird and give legal sanction to the religious practices mentioned above. Our religious customs are with us without constitutional sanction. And yet they belong to our American life. It wouldn't be the American way if we didn't have these things. They form a very essential part of our unwritten constitution, and they ought to have legal sanction in our fundamental written law.

As a foundation for all these Christian features and as a basis for all moral action on the part of the Government and the Nation we need the divine acknowledgment provided for in this bill.

I leave it to others to lay stress on the obligation we as a nation owe to God. We read in II Chronicles 7:14:

If My people, which are called by My name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sins, and will heal their land.

The Bible makes it very clear that nations as well as individuals are accountable before God. It is our firm conviction that the failure of the Nation to acknowledge Almighty God as the source of all power and authority, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, and His will as of supreme authority in political life constitutes the greatest sin of which we as a nation are guilty, and is the taproot from which many of the other evils in our land today are springing forth to plague us.

We respectfully urge you to act favorably on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Patterson, for a very fine statement.

Are there any questions?

Call the next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. R. H. Martin.

STATEMENT OF DR. R. H. MARTIN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Dr. MARTIN. Senator, I am not going to read all of my statement. I sort of left myself open here to hear the discussion. I may want to bring in some things that are not in here and I may pass on some things.

I submit the following testimony on behalf of this proposed amendment:

1. Inasmuch as this amendment would include in our fundamental law, the Constitution of the United States, a recognition of the authority and law of Jesus Christ, the question naturally arises, Where shall we go to find what that authority and law is? The answer is, To the Bible.

I submit the following testimony from outstanding American statesmen to the contribution which the Bible has made to our American civilization and Nation; and all of these I believe are from Presidents of the United States.

President Andrew Jackson said:

The Bible is the rock on which this Republic rests.

President Thomas Jefferson said:

The Bible is the source of liberty. I have always said, and I always will say, that the studious perusal of the sacred volume will make better citizens.

President U. S. Grant:

To this book we are indebted for the progress made in our civilization and to this book we must look as our guide in the future.

President William McKinley:

The more profoundly we study this wonderful book and the more closely we observe its divine precepts, the better citizens we will become and the higher will be the destiny of our Nation.

President Theodore Roosevelt:

The Bible has been the Magna Carta of the poor and the oppressed. Nowhere is the fundamental truth that the welfare of the state depends on the righteousness of its citizens so strongly laid down. The Bible is the most democratic book in the world.

President Woodrow Wilson:

There are great problems before the American people. I would be afraid to go forward if I did not believe that there lay at the foundation of all our schooling and all our thought the incomparable and unimpeachable Word of God.

President Calvin Coolidge:

The foundations of society and government rest so much on the teachings of the Bible that it would be difficult to support them if faith in these teachings should cease to be practically universal in this country.

Also from our two greatest Presidents:

It is impossible to govern the world without the Bible.—George Washington—and I am sure he included the United States.

In regard to the Great Book, I have only to say it is the best gift God has given to men. But for it we would not know right from wrong.—Abraham Lincoln.

Now, Senator Langer and the committee, I submit that these statements and many others of like character that have been made about the Bible, lying at the very foundation of our American civilization and our American life, I say that is an argument why we ought to have in our fundamental law a recognition of this fact and that we would have, I think under this proposed amendment.

Now, the question may come up, and as I believe was submitted to me, Who is going to interpret the Bible in reference to these matters?

If this amendment passes, as I see it, it would make the Bible the lawbook of the Nation, not on theology and baptism and all things in the sacraments, but as the fundamental law on morals; that is, your Bible standard of morals would be the foundation or basis for the enactment of the laws by the legislators of this Nation.

Now, I believe as it is today, we do not have any established standards—legal standards—in this Nation. We do have Christianity and Christian morals are generally recognized as the morals we follow, whether we live up to them or not.

Now, my point is that an amendment such as is offered here today would make the Bible really the moral standard of this Nation.

I think that would be a great thought.

As to the interpretation, it would not be my church or the Catholic; the state would interpret the Bible for itself just the same as it does the Constitution at this time. No church would come into the matter whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of a better way for me to get the Senators or lawmakers to study the Bible. It is the greatest book on political science or on government the world has. If we would only study that book and then try to implement that moral standard to the moral problems of this Nation, like marriage and divorce, religion in public education, and the Lord's Day, and all that, I think that would be a tremendous help to this Nation.

Now, my second point here is one I am going to cut short.

Our State constitutions contain religious acknowledgments. Why not our National Constitution? That has been gone into.

If you will permit me to say, very recently I made an investigation of the preambles of the States of the United States. I found that there are 42 States which have preambles. Of those 42, 41 make religious acknowledgments. Now, that has all been referred to.

I have a sort of summation of that whole thing here in many testimony. I am not going to read them all, but I want to make just a short comment on some of them. All of these contain religious acknowledgments which set forth in varying terms the relationship of these commonwealths to God, their obligation to him, express gratitude for His favors, and implore His aid.

Then there are others now who go further than that. Here are Colorado, Maine, Massachusetts, and a number of them.

The Massachusetts preamble says:

Acknowledging with grateful hearts the goodness of the great Legislator of the universe.

North Carolina :

Grateful to Almighty God, the sovereign ruler of nations, for the preservation of the American Union. * * * acknowledging our dependence upon Him for the continuance of these blessings to us and our posterity.

The one exception is Oregon. Its preamble is as follows :

We, the people of the State of Oregon, to the end that justice be established, order maintained, and liberty perpetuated, do ordain this constitution.

That is the one exception of those who have preambles.

What about the six States that do not have preambles? In their bill of rights in their constitutions there is an assertion of the inalienable right of worshiping God according to the dictates of one's own conscience and the guaranty of protection in the exercise of this right.

The bill of rights of Vermont contains this same guaranty of the rights of worship and then adds :

Every sect or denomination of Christians ought to observe the Sabbath or Lord's day, and to keep up some sort of religious worship, which to them shall seem most agreeable to the revealed will of God.

That goes beyond that.

Then take Virginia's bill of rights. Jefferson, you know, wrote that.

All men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience ; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity toward each other.

That is in the constitution of that State.

Now one of the questions I raise is : When you have all that in the State constitutions why should we not come along with the National Constitution in making a similar recognition ?

Now my next point here has reference to our Jewish brethren who are opposing this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. They have not opposed it yet. They may be for it.

Dr. MARTIN. Well, I will give this as counsel to them. This is my point.

Our Jewish brethren here, whom we highly esteem, owe a profound debt to Christianity and to Christianity's head, whom we believe to be Jesus Christ.

This debt is expressed by one of the great men of the Jewish faith—Disraeli, the Jewish Premier of Great Britain. He said :

Perhaps too, in this enlightened age, as his mind expands and he takes a comprehensive view of this period of progress, the pupil of Moses may ask himself whether all the princes of the house of David have done so much for the Jews as the Prince who was crucified on Calvary.

Had it not been for Him the Jews would have been comparatively unknown, or known only as a high Oriental caste which had lost its country. Has he not made their history the most famous history in the world? Has he not hung up their laws in every temple? Has he not avenged the victims of Titus and conquered the Caesars? What successes did they anticipate from their Messiah? The wildest dreams of their rabbis have been far exceeded. Has not Jesus conquered Europe and changed its name into Christendom? All countries that reject the cross wither while the whole of the New World is devoted to the Semitic principle and its most glorious offspring, the Jewish faith ; and the time will come when the vast communities and countless myriads of America and Australia, looking upon Europe as Europe now looks upon Greece, and wondering how so small a space could have achieved such great deeds, will find music in the songs of Zion and will seek solace in the parables of Galilee.

I respectfully call the attention of our good brothers here that they do owe a profound debt to Christ. Where do they have their liberties? Where do they have their freedom? Not in Russia, not in Germany after Germany became de-Christianized. But here in Christian America.

Now I want to follow that up with a little personal experience I had recently. I was coming over from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh and passed through one of the suburbs of Philadelphia and stopped there and had a conference with the pastor of one of the large Protestant denominations of that city.

In the course of our conversation the matter came up somehow about our Jewish brethren. This pastor said to me, "You know, the Jewish rabbi in this town and I are great friends." He said, "Our wives have their birthdays on the same day of the year and for a number of years it has been our custom to go out and take dinner together on those birthdays." He said, "We just had a dinner here the other day. This Jewish rabbi turned to me and he said, 'You know, I would like to see Christianity succeed.' He said, 'What, aren't you a Jew?' 'Yes,' he said, 'but it is the only hope of the Jew, the success of Christianity is the only hope of the Jews.'"

Brethren, in all honesty and sincerity, I believe that to be true. I am a Christian. I am a Protestant Christian. I will stand for the rights of the Jews in this country. He has rights and liberties and freedom and those liberties and freedom come from God and they have been coming down to us from Christianity.

The CHAIRMAN. The trouble is you are in the wrong place, you ought to be on the floor of the Senate.

Dr. MARTIN. You get me elected and I will go. Somebody told me once that I ought to be a lawyer or a preacher. I do not know whether that is true or not.

I want to preface what I will say here by the fact that I was a teacher in Geneva College. I tried to run that school for a few years. I foolishly undertook to do some teaching. I taught the Bible. And I did a little teaching in political science.

Years after that—that has been 30 years or more—not long ago one of the ladies that was a student came to me and she said, "There is one thing I got out of your teaching which has been a great help to me." I said to the young lady, "What is it?" She said, "You taught us that this world is a moral order, this world is a moral order."

Now in order to enlarge on that let me quote here a sentence which I find in the course of American democratic thought, written by Prof. Ralph Gabriel in this book:

The basic postulate of the democratic faith affirms that God, the Creator of man, has also created the moral law for his government and has endowed him with a conscience with which to apprehend him. Underneath and supporting human society as the basic rock supports the hills is a moral order which is the abiding place of the eternal principles of truth and righteousness.

That is what I tried to teach those youngsters, and, thank the Lord, some of them got hold of it.

When God created this moral universe, when He created man, He also created a moral law for man's government, and He wrote it in his

conscience and we have the revelation of it in the revealed will of God in the Bible.

Underneath—

he says—

and supporting human society as the basic rock supports the hills is this moral order which is the abiding place of the eternal principles of truth and righteousness.

Senator Langer, that is the foundation on which this world rests. It is the foundation of America. It is this moral order of God, and it is the foundation on which all nations must rest if we are ever going to have righteousness and peace in this world.

And, sir, all law enacted by governments, all law that has to do with moral issues, goes back to these eternal principles of truth or righteousness which are imbedded in the very constitution of man and in the constitution of human society.

I say to you, Senator, and those on your committee, to put down into the fundamental law of this land a recognition of that fact gives us a foundation, as Andrew Jackson said, that gives us a rock on which to raise this great republic and as far as we have been able, great and glorious, and I think we are the greatest Nation on the face of God's earth, and I think the hope of America rests on it, due to that very fact, we are building on that foundation.

Now, let me close by relating something that took place, not in the coronation of our Queen of Great Britain recently, but in the coronation of Victoria, when the young Victoria was crowned Queen of the British Empire.

In the coronation ceremony at a certain place a great choir was to sing Handel's Messiah. It is the custom, I am told of the British audience when they come to the Hallelujah Chorus in the oratorio all to rise, but the ladies who were in waiting and were preparing the young Queen for her part in the ceremony told her that being Queen it would not be proper for her to rise, she could remain seated.

So when that choir began to sing that great oratorio the audience rose, but the Queen remained seated, but when they came to that burst of song, "King of kings and Lord of lords," the Queen quietly rose and bowed her crowned head in expression of the fact that she as the Queen of that mighty empire was a loyal and obedient servant of the King of kings.

Senator, that is the great purpose of this organization of which I have the honor and responsibility of being president for a quarter of a century.

I have gone up and down this land and proclaimed this and all these brothers here, and many others, have done the same thing, all to the fact of setting before them these great truths that we have tried to bring before you so that we would come to a time when the citizenship of this Nation knowing these truths and believing them, would come forward and lay the crown of this Nation's sovereignty at the feet of Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone else here wish to testify or appear in favor of this amendment?

**STATEMENT OF DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD, SUPERINTENDENT OF
THE INTERNATIONAL REFORM FEDERATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

Dr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have heard all of the addresses that have preceded mine. If I were to prepare my address now, probably not one word of what I am going to say would have been written.

I am so much more competent and wiser than I was. I pay a compliment to the gentlemen and ladies who have been heard.

I have been identified with my organization, the International Reform Federation, for 59 years. I have never attended during all of those years a more intellectual presentation than I have listened to at this hearing.

Who can come after the king? The gentleman whose magnificent address we have just heard is one of the trustees of our organization.

I take some credit for the wisdom he has displayed.

When I prepared this address, dictated it to my stenographer, it covered nine pages. As I listened to the eloquence of the other speakers, I began to reduce my own copy. I have gotten it down to three.

Honorable Senator, and we all know and respect and love you, and gentlemen of the committee, the battle against the bottle is as old as the ages. Quotations from secular authorities antedate those quoted below from Holy Writ from the Old Testament, while we learn from the New Testament that both John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were pledged to a life of total abstinence by the Angel Gabriel that appeared to Zachariah, father of John, and to Mary, mother of Jesus. This pledge applied to mothers and children before their birth.

Despite the fact that this is a committee hearing on proposed legislation and not a religious service, I beg your indulgence to permit me to select an appropriate text from Holy Writ found in the first verse of the 20th chapter of the book of Proverbs, given to King Solomon by divine inspiration:

Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging; and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise.

From the same divine authority, Proverbs 23, I quote:

Who hath woe? Who hath sorrow, who hath contentions? Who hath babbling? Who hath wounds without cause? Who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed drink. Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, with it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder. Thine eyes shall behold strange women, thine heart shall utter perverse things. Yea, thou shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea * * * when I awake I will seek it yet again.

There are further admonitions, addressed particularly to rulers, one of which I desire to quote from the 31st chapter:

Lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of the afflicted.

From the same divine authority we have the prophecy of Isaiah in the 4th chapter, 20th verse:

Woe unto them that call evil good, that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink; which justify the wicked for a reward, and take away the righteous from him.

Again I quote from Holy Writ (Habakkuk 2: 15) :

Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink; and makest him drunken also. And again from the same divine authority, we read :

Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim * * *. They also have erred through wine and through strong drink are gone out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through wine * * * they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment.

Then follows the judgment of the Lord upon those who "have made a covenant with death, and with hell are in agreement"—"your covenant with death shall be annulled and your agreement with hell shall not stand."

Both religious and secular authorities have condemned the use of and the traffic in alcoholic liquor.

In 1340, William Chaucer said:

Character and shame depart when wine comes in.

In 1600 William Shakespeare said :

O, thou invisible spirit of wine, if thou hast no name to be known by, let us call thee Devil.

In 1863, Abraham Lincoln said :

Reasonable men of the world have long since agreed that intemperance is one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, of all evils among mankind. That is not a matter of dispute. That the disease exists and that it is a very great one is agreed upon by all.

And on an earlier occasion he said :

Whether or not the world would be vastly benefited by the total banishment from it of all intoxicating liquors seems to me not now an open question. Three-fourths of mankind confesses the affirmative with their tongues, and, I believe, all the rest acknowledge it in their hearts * * *

Turn now to the temperance revolution. In it we shall find a stronger bondage broken, a viler slavery manumitted, a greater tyrant deposed; in it, more of want supplied, more of disease healed, more sorrow assuaged. By it no orphans starving, no widows weeping, none wounded in feeling, none injured in interest * * *

If the relative grandeur of revolutions shall be estimated by the great amount of human misery they alleviate and the small amount they inflict then indeed this will be the grandest the world shall have ever seen.

Happy day, when all appetites controlled, all passions subdued, all matter subjected, mind, all conquering mind, shall live and move the monarch of the world. Glorious consummation. Hail fall of fury; reign of reason, all hail.

And when that victory shall be complete—when there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on the earth—how proud the title of that land which may truly claim to be the birthplace and cradle of both those revolutions, that shall have ended in that victory. (Lincoln's address on Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1842, at Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Ill., at the age of 33, as published in the Sagamon Journal.)

In 1898 William E. Gladstone said :

The ravages of drink are greater than those of war, pestilence, and famine combined.

In 1915, Cardinal Gibbons said :

The curse of the laboring man is intemperance. It has brought more desolation to wage earners than strikes, or war, or sickness, or death. It has caused little children to be hungry and cold and to grow up among evil associations. It has broken up more homes and wrecked more lives than any other cause.

In 1920 Georges Clemenceau said :

It is definitely settled that alcohol is a poison destructive of human energy and, for this reason, society as a whole.

In 1928, Sir Wilfred Grenfell said:

Alcohol has wrecked more lives, starved more children, and murdered more women than any other factor.

Dr. Le Bove, of the Academy of Paris, says:

The fortunes of the liquor dealers are built upon millions of corpses.

Dr. G. Sims Woodhead, of Cambridge University, says:

Man by moderate amount of alcohol pays the price in mental paralysis of his sense. He cannot trust them to give him correct facts and he cannot rely upon his judgment for the interpretation of facts.

There is no limit to statements made even more recently by moral, physical, and scientific authorities that might be quoted in support of the Bryson bill now pending before this committee. The International Reform Federation joins with other organizations here represented in requesting this committee to make a favorable report, and to give to the Congress an opportunity to debate passage of such a bill as a reasonable restraint against the interstate transportation of alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes.

With these 3 pages I will submit the other 6. Thank you for your patience.

(The statement referred to was not submitted.)

The CHAIRMAN. You have done a tremendous amount of good for the people around this table today.

Mr. COLEMAN. Might I offer for filing certain other arguments on behalf of this? This is the testimony of Mrs. Albert F. Leonhard, president of the Pennsylvania Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

They are resolutions only for filing.

Then a letter from her in which she declares she regrets she cannot be here, but that she sends resolutions adopted by delegates representing 37,000 members of the Pennsylvania WCTU convention on behalf of the Christian amendment.

A statement of the Christian Amendment Movement and its purpose.

A copy of the address of Peter Marshall, New Glory for the Old Glory, which was put in the Congressional Record by the Honorable Harley M. Kilgore, a member of this committee.

Then a short statement entitled "Christ Is Our Moral Governor."

Then a discussion of the church-state problem.

Then a copy of the Christian Patriot, which is the organ of this movement, and then the extension of remarks, really a sermon, by Billy Graham, put in the Congressional Record by the Honorable Wingate H. Lucas, a sermon by Billy Graham on the Faith of George Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. They will all be admitted.

(The documents referred to are as follows:)

WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION
OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Pittsburgh, Pa, May 15, 1954.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,

*Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am Mrs. Albert F. Leonhard, president of Pennsylvania Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

I regret very much that circumstances beyond my control prevent me from appearing personally to testify in favor of the Christian amendment bill (S. J. Res. 87).

However, may I have the privilege of submitting to you the sentiment of Pennsylvania WCTU as expressed in the following resolution which was adopted unanimously by the delegates representing 37,000 members in their 79th annual convention meeting in Lancaster, Pa., October 5-9, 1953:

"Whereas we, the members of the Pennsylvania Woman's Christian Temperance Union, met in convention in Lancaster, Pa., October 5-9, 1953, have been deeply stirred by the statistical reports and inspirational addresses of this convention, we hereby renew our dedication to the service of our Saviour, and reconsecrate to Him our time, our talents, and our things, that He may use them as He will. We hear Him still calling the women of our organization to leadership in the fight against those things which defile a man: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That—

"Whereas the history of our Nation shows undoubtedly that the Founding Fathers believed in Almighty God as the Supreme Ruler of nations; that nations are bound to acknowledge His authority; that Jesus Christ is the appointed way of acceptance for nations as well as for individuals before God; that God's word, the Holy Scriptures, is given for national correction and guidance; and

"Whereas secularism and communism have been manifesting themselves as assailants of our country, seeking the overthrow of our existing institutions and aiming at the utter dechristianizing of the state; and have succeeded all too well by their banishing of the Bible from the public schools in a number of instances, in the repeal of the Sabbath laws of most of our States, in the repeal of the 18th amendment and the increase in the sale and distribution of intoxicating liquors; and

"Whereas this all shows the necessity of the Nation's getting back to God: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That our organization places itself on record as favoring the effort of the Christian amendment movement for a national acknowledgment of the authority and law of Jesus Christ in the Constitution of the United States as a means of establishing a Christian basis upon which to carry forward all moral reforms."

It was the consensus of opinion of those assembled—

(1) That had our Founding Fathers who believed so firmly in the Bible—who cherished a deep sense of their dependence upon God and who recognized Jesus Christ as the criterion of all their hopes and Christian aspirations officially recognized the kingship of Jesus Christ when writing the Constitution, the history of our Nation would not be as it is today.

(2) The Bible would be so established and so firmly entrenched in the public schools of our Nation that no group of individuals regardless of prestige or financial backing could have removed it.

(3) Generations of children who have committed to memory the Constitution of the United States would have accepted Christ as the spiritual leader of our Nation and today America would be known as a Christian nation in the true sense of the word.

May I add, today we are faced with a great wave of juvenile delinquency. It is conservatively estimated that 1 out of every 50 juveniles is a delinquent—one who has come into direct contact with the law.

What has brought about this tidal wave of criminality among the youth of our Nation? J. Edgar Hoover says, "It did not come overnight. It has been developing for years. It is deep rooted. Something has happened to the moral stamina of America. When one reduces the whole problem to fundamentals the answer is simple: People for the most part commit crime because they do not have the moral stamina and traits of character to withstand temptation."

Would this be so if the lordship of Jesus Christ had been officially recognized and written into our Constitution? Can we not trace the decline of the moral stamina of our Nation from the time our Founding Fathers failed to do this?

It is estimated that 90 percent of the juvenile delinquents of today have received no religious training in the home; have not attended church or Sunday school and have come under no religious influence whatsoever. If Jesus Christ had been given His rightful place as Lord and Ruler of our Nation, if this had been written into the Constitution of the United States, would it not be safe to assume that every child attending our public schools would have come under some religious instruction and influence?

Truths implanted in the plastic mind of a child are lasting and the abiding precepts of the Bible brought to them day by day would have developed the moral stamina and strong traits of character necessary in the building of a strong Christian America.

Therefore, it would seem we have failed as a nation to put God first in the thinking of our boys and girls—our most precious heritage.

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord. If we believe this, it may not be too late to stop the disintegration of the moral stamina of our Nation.

Therefore, we appeal to you to approve the Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States, namely, "This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.

Sincerely yours in His name,

EMMA O. LEONHARD
Mrs. A. F. Leonhard.

[From the Congressional Record, 80th Cong., 1st sess.]

NEW GLORY FOR OLD GLORY

Extension of remarks of Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, in the Senate of the United States, Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the Record, a sermon delivered on Sunday, June 29, by Dr. Peter Marshall, pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church of Washington, and Chaplain of the Senate. I have read this sermon several times and, in my opinion, it is a work of deep religious significance—a message of guidance not only for those of us who have the great honor to serve in the United States Senate, but, also for all the people of this great land. The Nation as well as the Senate should indeed be proud of Dr. Peter Marshall.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"NEW GLORY FOR OLD GLORY

"Text: Acts 22: 28: 'And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was freeborn.'

"The proud boast of the captain who held Paul prisoner, that he had paid for his political freedom with big money, reflects the ancient and mistaken idea that freedom can be bought or sold, conferred, or withdrawn.

"Paul's confident reply that he was freeborn, that his freedom was a matter of birthright, shows an understanding that rests on much higher principles.

"In a few days, all over this country, there will be celebrated the 171st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. The celebration will be marked as usual with holidays, special sports events, picnics, orations, and fireworks. And yet I wonder how many of those who celebrate the Fourth of July will understand the meaning of what they celebrate.

"Perhaps in the noise, in the explosion of fireworks, in the music of the bands, and the shouting of the people, whispers from the past will be totally unheard.

"There will be voices from Valley Forge whispering, 'With a great sum obtained I this freedom.'

"There will be whispers from Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill, from Trenton and Princeton, aye, and from Mount Vernon and Monticello, 'We paid a great price for this freedom.'

"Perhaps these whispers will never be heard.

"If they were, it would be amazing how many voices would join in and from what widely scattered parts of the country and from what distant lands the message would come.

"One thing is clear—the freedom that was purchased 171 years ago was not paid for in one down payment. Installments have been kept up for more than two lifetimes, for this is one possession that exacts a perpetual price.

"There is a danger then in your sitting back smugly applauding when the flag is thrown upon the movie screen, puffing yourself up with pride, as you boast of America. For you were freeborn.

"Unless you have lived in other lands, unless you have known hunger and persecution, unless you have come as an immigrant, to this good land, you have absolutely no idea how good it is. You cannot fully appreciate its blessings. Nor can you truly be grateful, since you have no conception of what it means to be without all the things you take for granted.

You have never known anything else. It is because they who went before you were willing to stake their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, that you have what you now enjoy.

"But you forget how bitterly it was won. You forget how great a price was paid. This is, indeed, a land of plenty. But that does not mean that we have a right to waste our resources.

"The story of the waste of this country's riches is a sad story of greed and selfishness. It has been estimated that there were not less than 75 million head of buffalo roaming this continent at the time the white man was making the first colonies. Today there are only about 4,000 left.

"The wildlife of this Nation has long been exploited to satisfy the greed and the so-called sporting instincts of free Americans.

"Many species of native American wildlife have been exterminated, such as the great auk, the Pallas cormorant, the Labrador duck, the passenger pigeon, the heath hen, the Eskimo curlew, and the Carolina parakeet.

"Of the mammals, the giant mink has gone. The grizzly bear has been nearly exterminated. The trumpeter swan, the canvas back duck, the redhead, the upland plover, the whooping crane, and the ivory-billed woodpecker may in a few years be completely wiped out, all because some people said, 'This is a free country. I have a right to hunt, shoot, and kill.'

"So the patriot enjoyed himself killing birds, killing more than he could give away, so that the next year there were fewer birds, and at last there were none at all.

"The same kind of greed and selfishness was shown in our treatment of the land. It was good land, but we were greedy. We wanted money crops, and the slogan was 'Plow and plant, plow and plant.'

"Well, we plowed, for 50 years we chopped cotton and moved West when the land gave out. For 50 years we plowed for corn, and moved on when the land gave out."

"Corn and wheat; wheat and cotton—we planted and plowed with no regard for the future. And 400 million tons of our most valuable natural resources have been washed into the Gulf of Mexico every year. Three hundred thousand acres of good topsoil dumped into the ocean.

"Our reckless stripping away of the vegetable cover of the soil has driven out the animals and invited the forces of erosion, which are now exacting the terrific toll of 300,000 acres of land every year. This is equivalent to dumping into the ocean each year 1,875 farms of 160 acres each.

"It has made red clay gullies in the Southland; it has made Dust Bowl storms in the Middle West; it has made prairies and deserts; and more than half of our total land surface has been damaged by erosion.

"When the white colonists first came to this continent this kind of erosion was unknown. It can be traced directly to the wholesale removal of the original vegetable cover, to the destruction of forests, and the plowing of prairies and plains.

"Surely freedom does not mean that people can do as they like with the country's resources.

"The same wanton waste and disregard for the future is to be seen in the almost criminal waste of oil, thousands of barrels of oil wasted every month; in the deforestation of our country, when the slogan seemed to be 'Cut and sell, cut and sell,' with never a thought of planting young trees, never a thought of preserving the timberland, as if there were a supply that would never be exhausted.

"The natural resources of America are the heritage of the whole Nation, and should be conserved and utilized for the benefit of all our people.

"There is, however, a higher concept of freedom, higher than something that can be conferred or withdrawn, higher than something that is an accident of birth, and that is that freedom is an endowment of every human soul.

"This was the great idea that nurtured the young Republic struggling to be born in 1776.

"It seems to be forgotten or ignored today, but history proves that the inspiration of this fundamental idea of our democratic faith came from the deep spiritual reservoirs of our religious heritage.

"The source of democracy is Christianity, and liberty comes from God. This teaching is as old as the Bible. The word of God declares that if a nation is to live it must depend on God; and if it refuses, it will die.

"Our Pilgrim forefathers believed this truth, for the first thing they did in America was to dedicate their venture to God. The Mayflower Compact, the first civil document drawn up on our shores, acknowledges God in these words:

"'In the name of God, amen.

"'We, having undertaken, for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith, do by these presents solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God

and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic.'

"Later we find the compacts and charters of all the early colonies giving a very definite place to God. No better statement of the relationship of God to government is found anywhere than in the great law of Pennsylvania, which was passed December 7, 1682. This document said:

" 'Whereas the glory of Almighty God, and the good of mankind, is the reason and end of government, and, therefore, government in itself is a venerable ordinance of God.'

"Notice these two ideals: Government is for God's glory and is ordained by Him. Is it not true that we as a nation have largely forgotten these ideals today? We have government 'of the people, by the people, for the people.' But we lack a government of the people of God by God.

"Many examples might be cited from colonial history to show the close relationship which existed between God and the Government of that day.

"In the Declaration of Independence, the framers of that noble document three times emphasized God's part in their struggle for independence. The Declaration closed, 'With a firm reliance upon the protection of divine providence.'

"This was a statement of the firm conviction that prevailed in the minds and hearts of the Founding Fathers.

"It is strange, and I believe tragic, that the Constitution makes no reference to God. It was not a perfect document, as all the amendments prove.

"It took 19 years to insert the first 10 amendments, which are known as the Bill of Rights. Public criticism and the grumbling of the men who had fought for freedom finally forced the Congress to make constitutional provision for the rights of men, but no amendment has yet acknowledged the rights of God.

"Many efforts have been made at different times to introduce such an amendment, but there has been opposition and indifference, so to this good day the Constitution of our country ignores the principles upon which our country was founded.

"Forty-three of our States have already written into their constitutions vague religious acknowledgments. All make some reference to a higher power, but not one State honors Jesus Christ.

"Christ said: 'He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent Him.' Christ said again: 'All authority has been given unto me in heaven and earth.'

"God can be honored only through His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. All pious, vague affirmations about God as the Supreme Being, etc., are vain unless supreme honor is specifically given to Jesus Christ.

"The classic lines of J. G. Holland were never more challenging than now:

" 'God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And scorn his treacherous flattering without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.'

"Yes, we need men like this, but our greatest need is for men who know and believe God's word; men who will rule in the fear of God.

"The first question about all candidates for public office should be: 'Do these men know their God, and will they rule in the fear of God?'

"Christian rulers need to know their Bible better than any other book. Large portions of the Bible are filled with instructions for nations and rulers; what they are to do, and how they are to serve.

"For the most part, this instruction is discarded by statesmen of the world today. It is time we put the Bible back into our Government; time that our statesmen began to make their decisions on all moral questions on the basis of the authority of God's holy word.

"In his book, *The Christ of the American Road*, Dr. E. Stanley Jones speaks of the fading of Christianity from our national life. He tells of a cartoon in which Uncle Sam, standing on the ship of state, turns and says to the representatives of the Christian faith, 'It is your business to keep off from the ship of state the barnacles of greed, selfishness, and dishonesty.'

"'And that was supposed to be a compliment to religion,' says Jones. 'It was to keep off the barnacles, but was to have nothing to say about the directing of the ship.'"

"This is the common attitude today in America toward Christ and the civil government. Christ is useful to help keep barnacles off the ship of state, but it would never do to let Him take over the helm.

"But, of course, Christ cannot direct the ship of state until He is permitted to direct the lives of the people. Were He permitted to do that, great changes would come about in our national life.

"All religious practices, all church services and pious observances mean nothing at all unless they result in the willingness of individuals like you and me to surrender their lives to Christ, to let Him guide them in decisions, to let Him lead them in action, and to look to him for the power to do His will.

"There is a shoe manufacturer named Johnson who has no trouble whatsoever in his factory. His relations with labor are excellent. Strikes are unheard of.

"And why? Because he determined in his business to do what was right and to treat his employees as Christ directed.

"That spirit in his business is a model and an example to the Nation.

"The same thing could happen in a coal mine if the owner thoroughly surrendered to Christ, began to run his coal mine according to Christ's guidance; if the owner determined that in his mine every invention and device of modern science would make the mine as safe as is humanly possible; if he determined that for the comfort of the miners bathing facilities would be provided on the premises; if he made up his mind that the miners' homes would be equipped with all modern conveniences, and that the commissary would be stocked with goods at the price levels existing elsewhere; if he felt a concern for the welfare of his men and their families, in seeing that hospitals and schools were available.

"I am not suggesting that the whole responsibility for labor unrest lies upon employers, but I do say without fear of contradiction that where employers are God-guided men, where they are filled with the spirit of Christ, and where they are willing to run their business as Christ runs them, then I say that labor troubles would vanish.

"But it has been proved that where labor union leaders come face to face with such a spirit, their own spirit of rebellion and hostility and suspicion, their unreasonable attitudes and the hatred in their hearts is melted and broken down.

"'It is a beautiful theory,' you may say, 'and it would be fine if that were so. But it isn't so; human nature being what it is.'

"But I am here to say that human nature can be changed and human nature must be changed if this Nation is to survive, and if she is to become what the Founding Fathers intended her to become.

"But I know perfectly well that there can never be a new spirit in America until it begins with you and me—in our homes, in our business, in our friendships, and in our relations with other people.

"And so I would focus my plea first to myself and then to you who are listening to me now: 'Is Christ the head of your home?' 'Does He guide your decisions?' 'Do you consult Him about your problems?' 'Are you honestly trying every day to do what Christ wants you to do?' You must answer those questions for yourself.

"But not until your answer is 'Yes' is there much hope that this Nation can become God's own country.

"It is only God-guided lives, it is only by applying Christ's solutions to the problems that plague us, it is only by living under His blessing and guidance that we can ever hope to add any new glory to Old Glory."

[From the Christian Patriot, March 1954]

NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF WCTU ENDORSES CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT

Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, eighth president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and formerly vice president for 3 years, took office on November 1, 1953.

Mrs. Hays inherited her devotion to temperance work from her parents, who were both leaders in local temperance activities. She attended the State Teachers College in Kansas and became a teacher of English and Latin in the Kansas and Oklahoma schools.

She has written numerous skits and plays for school use, sponsored a Loyal Temperance Legion, been State president of Kansas WCTU, the national recording secretary, editor of the Kansas State paper and author of the White Ribbon in the Sunflower State, a historical account of Kansas WCTU, recently published.

Mrs. Glenn G. Hays says:

"It is gratifying to me to have the opportunity to submit my endorsement of the Christian amendment movement. Recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ in the United States Constitution could be a powerful impetus toward making our Nation truly Christian."

THE STRENGTH OF AMERICA

Elisha was dying. By the bedside in his humble lodging stood the strong young King of Israel, Joash. As he watched the life ebbing from the old prophet, who had been like a father to him, the youthful King could not hide his feelings. The tears ran down his face and he cried out, "O my father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof." What a grand tribute was paid Elisha in those words. For what the King meant was this, "You, my father, have meant more to this nation than her armies and weapons of war. You, by your life and character, your faith and your close walk with God, have been a means of salvation to us. What shall we do without you? For you have been chariots and horsemen to Israel."

The real strength of a nation does not lie in her armed forces, or in her atom or hydrogen bomb stockpiles. The strength of a nation—the strength of America—lies in her faithful Christian citizens. This is true because the salvation of America is in the hands of God, and God blesses a nation according as it serves and honors Him. The more God-fearing people there are in a country, the safer is that country. For 10 righteous men God would save Sodom, He told Abraham, but for a whole battalion of unbelievers Sodom could not be saved. Christian character is our first line of defense.

Our world is uneasy. The ominous threat of a tremendous war overshadows international relations. What preparations is our country making? She is appropriating billions of dollars to develop a potentially gigantic war machine. And with here great resources and manpower she is probably as well prepared as any nation in that regard. But in regard to that more important aspect of defense, national morality, America is dangerously weak. In his Farewell Address, President Washington said, "Religion and morality are the indispensable supports of political prosperity." Both religion and morality are at a low ebb in our land.

Major morality problems are the result of moral weakness in the common man. The moral strength or weakness of a nation is determined by the general public. When the people do not maintain a high degree of purity in thought, speech, and conduct; when they are attracted by those things which are sinfully suggestive or offcolor; When they put a low estimate on the sancity of marriage and the home; when they are more curious than concerned about crime and corruption, then the nation is weak. Such is the condition in our Nation. We are faced with tremendous morality problems which put us in danger of the destructive judgment of God.

The antidote for our present situation is regeneration and a revival of righteousness. Individual men must be regenerated—born again into the kingdom of Jesus Christ, through faith in Him as Saviour and Lord. And as more of the citizens of our land are won to Christ and trained in Christian living, the defenses of our Nation will be strengthened. However, we must not only win individuals to Christ, but also the Nation itself. For Christian people are an impregnable defense only when they are united in a Christian government. The basis of our Government is the Constitution, but as long as that Constitution gives no recognition to the authority and law of Christ, our Government is not based on a Christian foundation. Therefore, our defenses are weak, and must be strengthened by the Christianizing of our Constitution. Let us do this, and make America strong through the uniting of her righteous citizens in a nation under Christ.

THE ALTERNATIVE IN THE CHURCH-STATE PROBLEM

(By Hyman J. Appelman, Hebrew-Christian, lawyer-evangelist)

EVANGELISM IS BASIC

Christian evangelism is the great need of the hour in the United States and in the world, but it must not stop with the individual. The whole realm of social life needs Christ. The nations of the world need Christ. But a nation is more than a mere aggregate of Christian individuals. It is a social organism instituted by God and accountable as such to God through Christ the Mediator. The solution of all moral problems may be found by those who know Christ as Saviour and Lord and know how to apply His saving power and His holy law in dealing with these problems, whether individual or social.

TWO EXTREMES TO BE AVOIDED

One of the most pressing national problems is the church-state question. On one hand there is agitation toward what is feared may eventually result in a union of church and state. This is one extreme. To guard against this extreme there is very general agitation for a separation of state and religion into spheres where each would endeavor to achieve its noble purpose without regard to the other (U. S. Supreme Court). This is the other extreme. This latter is the result of a confusion in thinking with regard to "religion" and "church." The church is an institution in which religion is preeminent, but religion is not and cannot be confined to the church. It would require the repudiation of a large part of our national history to support such a contention.

EVANGELICAL CHRISTIAN CONCEPT

There is an alternative in this church-state question which is the true Christian position. It conceives of the state as an institution distinct and separate from the church, but of divine origin, accountable to Christ, King of Kings, and able to achieve its noble purpose only when striving to do so in recognition of and obedience to the authority and law of Jesus Christ, the Saviour and ruler of nations.

Hyman J. Appelman was born in Russia of orthodox Jewish parents. He was brought to America by his parents when he was 14 years old. He received his education in Chicago and was graduated from law school in 1921.

He was converted and became a Christian in Denver in 1925. He is a graduate of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. After serving as a pastor for several years he became a full-time evangelist. In 1948 he spent 6 months in Australia in an evangelistic campaign. He is generally recognized as one of the most effective evangelists in America today.

(Dr. Appelman endorsed the Christian amendment when it was first presented to him in 1947. His training in the law, no doubt, gives him a point of view with respect to the Christian amendment which many others do not have. As a lawyer and an evangelist, his judgment with respect to the alternative in the much-discussed church-state question is of peculiar significance.)

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT MOVEMENT

PURPOSE

The Christian Amendment Movement is an association of American citizens who are united in the effort to bring the United States of America to an acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

THE CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT

The proposed legislation is as follows:

"SECTION 1. This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.

"SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

BASIC PRINCIPLES

In the light of the Holy Scriptures and history we hold these principles to be true:

1. That church and state, having their origin from God, are both divine institutions;

2. That church and state are distinct and separate in the exercise of their appropriate and divinely prescribed powers, and therefore, control of the church by the state, or control of the state by the church, is contrary to the divine design;

3. That church and state in their respective spheres are subject to the authority of the Lord, Jesus Christ as the head of the church and the divinely appointed ruler of nations;

4. That church and state are equally obligated to acknowledge the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ;

5. That the failure of nations to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ as King of Kings must inevitably result in national ruin;

6. That in order to endure and prosper as a nation, the United States of America must confess the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour and King.

The Christian amendment is proposed as such an acknowledgment by our country.

ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION

Believing in these principles and in this objective, we hereby unit ourselves in a common effort to pray and labor for their realization in our national life, under the following articles:

Article I

This organization shall be known as the Christian Amendment Movement.

Article II

All persons who indicate approval of the Christian amendment by their signatures shall be members of the movement.

Article III

The official paper of the Christian Amendment Movement shall be known as the Christian Patriot.

Article IV

The funds with which to carry on the work of the Christian Amendment Movement shall be provided by subscriptions to the Christian Patriot together with contributions by members and friends.

Article V

The Christian Amendment Movement shall be under the leadership of an executive committee consisting of 15 members who shall be required to sign this Constitution. The term of office shall be 3 years. The first executive committee shall be appointed by the original signers of this Constitution in classes as follows: the first class of 5 members to serve for 1 year; the second class of 5 members to serve for 2 years; and the third class of 5 members to serve for 3 years. Each class thereafter shall be chosen at the annual meeting of the movement to serve for 3 years. The committee shall present nominations to the annual meeting. Members of the committee may be reelected. The executive committee shall elect its own officers annually. The officers shall be president, vice presidents, secretaries, and treasurer. The committee shall appoint such executive secretaries and field secretaries as may be necessary.

Article VI

An annual meeting of the movement shall be held on the last Tuesday of October, time and place to be decided by the executive committee. The executive officers and field secretaries as may be necessary.

Article VII

These articles of organization may be amended by a two-thirds vote of members present at any annual meeting, provided that any proposed amendment shall have been approved by a two-thirds vote of the executive committee at least 1 month before the annual meeting.

Article VIII

The executive committee is empowered to adopt such bylaws as are necessary for the work of the movement.

Article IX

Any groups or societies who will accept and adopt the purpose and principles of this constitution shall become regional or local chapters of the Christian Amendment Movement.

CHRIST IS OUR MORAL GOVERNOR—WILL WE ACKNOWLEDGE HIM?

I. IS THIS A CHRISTIAN NATION?

There is no mention of God, Christ, or the Bible in the Constitution of the United States. This fact has come as a distinct shock to many thousands who have heard of it for the first time.

The reason people are shocked is because we have been taught, and most of us have always believed, that this is a Christian Nation. In fact the Supreme Court in 1892 declared it so to be. It is true that Christianity predominates here more than any other religion. Our customs and practices as a Nation, all through the centuries, have shown our Christian training, but, the creed of our country, the Constitution of the United States, makes no such acknowledgment, and history has shown that people in time become like the government under which they live. (2 Chron. 12:1.)

Is this a Christian nation?

Let the following speak:

1. Justice of the Supreme Court

The Honorable William Strong, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, said in 1871:

"It is a serious matter if that Constitution (of the United States) should be found wanting in any principle or matter of fact. The deficiency will in due time work mischief. Error in the Constitution will work as powerfully as truth, and what is left out of it may one day be formally declared un-American. And one such serious matter there is: one unnecessary and most unfortunate omission. God and Christianity are not once alluded to, although the Constitution itself is the product of a Christian civilization, and although it purports to represent the mind of a Christian people. * * * Hence it is that all laws of this country in favor of a Christian morality are enacted outside the Constitution. They rest only on the basis of what is called common law. * * * And as matters seem to be going, it will soon be discovered and decreed that common law is only another name for custom, which has no binding force. And then where are we? In atheism, corruption, and anarchy."

2. Chaplain of Senate

The late Dr. Peter Marshall, while Chaplain of the Senate of the United States, preached a sermon on the need of Christ in our Government. He said:

"It is strange, and I believe tragic, that the Constitution makes no reference to God. * * * Many efforts have been made at different times to introduce such an amendment but there has been opposition and indifference, so to this good day the Constitution of our country ignores the principles upon which our country was founded. Forty-three States have already written into their constitutions vague religious acknowledgments * * * but not one State honors Jesus Christ. * * * all pious vague affirmations about God as the Supreme Being are vain unless supreme honor is specifically given to Jesus Christ."

Why have we left God out of our Federal Constitution? When we consider the Christian heritage that has been ours, and the definitely Christian civil documents, in the beginning of the life of our country, it is tragic indeed that the Constitution makes no reference to God. There is evidence that we, as a nation, have deliberately and intentionally gone away from God. Let us review history.

3. *Early civil documents*

The Mayflower compact, the first civil document drawn up on our shores, began thus:

"In the name of God, Amen. We * * * having undertaken for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith * * * do by these presents, solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another covenant and combine ourselves into a civil body politic * * *," etc.

The compacts of the Thirteen Colonies, almost without exception, had Christian acknowledgments. Note the wording of the Rhode Island compact:

"We, whose names are underwritten, do hereby solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah, incorporate ourselves into a body politic, and as He shall help will submit our persons, lives, and estates upon our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and to all those perfect laws of His given us in His holy word of truth, to be judged and guided thereby."

Notice the high ideal for civil government as found in the Great Law of Pennsylvania, 1638:

"Whereas the glory of Almighty God, and the good of mankind is the reason and end of government, and therefore government in itself, is a venerable ordinance of God * * *," etc.

A little later, as the Colonies began to unite, they put Christ and His Kingdom first. See the definite clear statement in the Articles of the New England Confederation, 1643:

"Whereas we all came into these parts of America with one and the same end, namely, to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to enjoy the liberties of the Gospel in purity and in peace * * *," etc.

But all this changed at the time of the Constitutional Convention. Those 55 men did a remarkable job in drawing up a Constitution for the United States, yet almost immediately, people began to talk about its two great omissions. They said, "You have no bill of rights for men, and you have left out—God."

The first of these omissions was taken care of within 2 years, when we drew up our Bill of Rights and men's rights and liberties were safeguarded, but the second, the rights of God, was not taken care of then, nor will it be until a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States has been adopted.

Again we ask, "Why was all recognition of God and Christ omitted from the Constitution?"

Various reasons have been suggested. One is that they forgot it; that it was an accidental oversight; another, that they were afraid of a union of church and state.

Several incidents prove that this omission was not accidental. One occurred at the time of the Convention, when Franklin asked for prayer, the other a few years later when we drew up our treaty with Tripoli.

4. *Benjamin Franklin*

During the fifth week of the Convention Benjamin Franklin, the oldest man in the group, made a motion that they look to God in prayer. They were having their differences and it looked as though the Convention might end in failure, so Franklin made this motion proposing prayer, making a most remarkable address in favor of his motion.

But this motion was opposed and after some discussion, someone made a motion that the Convention adjourn. That motion carried, automatically carrying Franklin's motion for prayer off the floor. Thus Franklin's motion was lost and it was never again renewed.

You will find the story of that motion in Madison's papers as recorded in Elliott's Debates, volume 5, page 255. In *The Works of Franklin*, by Sparkes, volume 5, page 155, you will find the story of this motion and address made by Franklin, also a footnote by Franklin in which he says, "The Convention except for Three or Four Persons thought Prayers Unnecessary."

5. *Treaty with Tripoli*

Another incident, showing that the leaving out of God was not accidental, happened about 9 years after the Constitutional Convention when our Government made a treaty with Tripoli. This treaty stated in article XI, "The Government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian Religion." This treaty was approved by the United States Senate, signed by the President of the United States, and was for a time a part of the supreme law of our land.

If the Constitution of the United States is not founded upon the Christian religion, what is it founded upon? If you take the two words, "United States,"

abbreviate them, and remove the period you have it "us." The Constitution of the United States is founded upon "us—we the people." We have taken God's place in the Government of this country and that act comes dangerously near breaking the first commandment which says, "Thou shall have no other Gods before me." Christ is the Supreme Lawgiver, and His word is the supreme law for men and nations, but according to the Constitution of the United States, "we" are the supreme lawgivers, and the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law in America. Thus we travel a very, very dangerous road.

II. THE "CHURCH AND STATE" QUESTION

Evidently God was not left out of our Constitution accidentally.

Was it then because they were afraid of a union of church and state?

Possibly that had something to do with it, yet it would seem that even in that day they should have been able to distinguish between a union of church and state and an acknowledgment by a nation of Christ as Saviour and King.

Just what would be involved in a union of church and state? It would require the establishing of some denomination as the state church. Let us suppose that we should make the Presbyterian Church the state church in this country, what would that mean? It would mean that the property of that denomination would belong to the state, and that all ministers and workers in that church would be paid out of the taxes. There would also be a fusion of the governments of the two organizations.

That certainly is something we do not want, and a Christian amendment would not mean that. God is acknowledged in 43 of our 48 State constitutions, and this does not mean a union of church and state in any of those States. Neither would an acknowledgment of Christ in our Federal Constitution mean a union of church and state in the United States. If it does, then what church? No church has a monopoly on Christ. He is King and Saviour of nations, as well as Head of the church.

III. THE CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT

In recent Congresses, the late Senator Arthur Capper, Congressman Louis E. Graham, Congressman Albert M. Cole, Senator Ralph E. Flanders, and Congressman Joseph R. Bryson have championed the rights of God by introducing the following Christian amendment resolution into their respective Houses:

"SECTION 1. This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, saviour and ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God."

"SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

The first section presents the amendment proper. Section 2 safeguards all present freedoms and makes doubly certain that we shall have no union of church and State. Section 3 authorizes Congress to safeguard the rights of citizens who are not Christian.

1. *Christ and the state*

There is an individualistic view of Christianity which is not scriptural. Moral responsibility to God exists through the whole realm of human life. Not only is the individual Christian to apply his Christianity to all phases of his life, but there is also such a thing as corporate responsibility. Just as the individual citizen, John Doe, is responsible to God, and it is his duty to become a Christian, so a corporate national body is collectively responsible to God and it is its duty to acknowledge God and the Lord Jesus Christ in its national law.

Abraham Lincoln in his proclamation of March 30, 1863, recognized this fact when he said, "It is the duty of nations as well as individuals to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God, to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow * * * and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in Holy Scripture and proven in all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord."

The old erroneous slogan: "Religion and politics don't mix" must be changed to say: "Religion and politics must be mixed." The word of God requires it. The present world tragedy and crisis come from people saying, "Religion and politics should not be mixed."

In a democracy, where a majority of the citizens are professing Christians, it is a grievous sin not to place a Christian acknowledgment in the Constitution of that country. God will hold any such nation responsible that refuses to accept Him. (Psalm 2: Isaiah 60: 12; Psalm 33: 12; Psalm 9: 17; Psalm 22: 28.)

The only way a nation can profess faith in Christ is by legal enactment. A corporate body, such as a nation, has to express its convictions and desires by the process of legislation. An individual can make up his mind about a matter and announce his decision, but a nation must arrive at its decision by parliamentary procedures and legislative processes.

Let us suppose that every citizen of this Nation were a Christian, and that all were members of the Southern Baptist Church. It would be a sin to unite church and state by making the Southern Baptist Church the established, or state church in this country; but it would be a much greater sin for a nation of professing Christians, to have a constitution of civil government and not acknowledge Christ, the Great Moral Governor, in that Constitution. Christ is the Redeemer of the human race, as an organism, as well as of individuals, and this organism includes human society and its institutions.

2. Uncle Sam's prayer

The late Dr. Pace drew a cartoon picturing Uncle Sam kneeling in prayer, pleading, "God be merciful to me a sinner." Uncle Sam does need to pray that prayer. Think of the sins he needs to confess. He must confess the sin of the liquor traffic. The Bible says, "No drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God" and Uncle Sam is taking revenue from every legal liquor dealer in America today. Thus Uncle Sam is guilty of promoting drunkenness in America. He is guilty of taking revenue from the gambler, guilty of our chaotic divorce laws, guilty of desecration of the Lord's day, and of many other violations of God's law.

But the greatest sin of which Uncle Sam is guilty, the one which is the root of all the rest, is the fact that Uncle Sam has turned his back upon the Lord Jesus Christ. We cannot expect good fruit to grow on a corrupt tree, neither can we expect Uncle Sam to act like a Christian when he is not a Christian.

In his book, *The Christ of the American Road*, Dr. E. Stanley Jones speaks of the fading of Christianity from our national life. He tells of a cartoon in which Uncle Sam, standing on the Ship of State, turns and says to the representatives of the Christian faith: "It is your business to keep the barnacles of greed, selfishness, and dishonesty off the Ship of State."

"And that was supposed to be a compliment to religion," says Dr. Jones. "It was to keep off the barnacles, but it was to have nothing to do with directing of the ship."

Is not this the common attitude today in America toward Christ and civil government? Christ is useful to keep off barnacles, but it would never do to let Him take over the helm. "We the people" must guide the ship, chart its course, and determine its destiny.

It is the purpose of the Christian amendment to put Christ back again at the helm of the Ship of State. We need Christ's pierced hand at the helm. We need his strength for the gathering storm.

3. What acknowledgment means

This acknowledgment means the life or death of our Nation. It means a spiritual revival all along the line: in our homes, our churches, and in our civic and educational life.

If our Nation were humbly to confess her sins before God, then publicly acknowledge Jesus Christ as King and Saviour of this great Nation, we could then expect the manifold blessings of God, as long as we continued to live up to our profession. But we could not expect God's blessing, without such a confession, no matter how many good works we did any more than an individual could be saved by his works without making a public acknowledgment of Christ. (Matthew 1: 32, 33.)

Why should any true American want to keep God out of our Constitution? That is what communism wants, and see what happens to liberty where godless communism holds sway. Remember the words of William Penn: "Men will be governed by God, or they will be ruled by tyrants."

4. *The non-Christian*

How will this Christian amendment affect the non-Christian? Where will it place the Jew? This movement is not anti-Semitic, or designed against any person or group of people. It is a pro-Christian movement and thus for the good of all.

Three representatives of the Christian Amendment Movement went to call upon the leaders of the American Jewish Committee in New York City. Those leaders were told that this is a Christian movement led by Christians and that there is no anti-Semitism in it. Dr. Moses Jung, one of the Jewish leaders, immediately replied, "Gentlemen, no true Christian can be anti-Semitic." How true that statement is, and it is just as true that "No true Christian nation can or would be anti-Semitic."

Suppose an atheist does object to this amendment; doesn't Christ have some rights? Wasn't this country dedicated to Christ in its beginnings, and doesn't it rightfully belong to Him?

Here is a home with several children. It has always been the practice in that home to observe Bible reading and prayer morning and evening. One of the sons grows up and eventually leaves home, goes to a far country, and comes home an atheist. The time of evening devotions comes and the son says, "Well, folks, I have outgrown that kind of thing. I hope you will be tolerant of my beliefs and discontinue all religious observances in this home from this time on."

Now what will the parents say? What will they do? Perhaps something like this: They will say, "Son, this is Christ's home. It was dedicated to Him in its beginning and it has always been His home. We will not force you to conform to the religious practices of this home, but you have no right to hinder us in giving our allegiance and devotion to God. We must obey God rather than man." Then they would go ahead and worship God in spite of the unbelieving son.

For 150 years this Nation was Christ's home. Shall we leave Him out now because there may be some who do not believe in Him?

IV. THE AMERICAN WAY—WHAT IS IT?

We are very tolerant in America, tolerant of everything and everyone except Jesus Christ and His law. It seems we cannot tolerate them.

On the wall of a restaurant hangs a calendar decorated with a beautiful picture. It is a church scene, a mother standing beside her soldier son, both singing in the choir. Behind them on the stained glass window is a picture of Christ kneeling in the Garden of Gethsemane in prayer. The title at the top of the picture is "The American Way." At the bottom of the picture is the name of the company sending out the picture, "The Metz Brewing Co." What concord has a brewery with the sacred agonies of Christ in Gethsemane?

This calendar illustrates the confusion and the cheapness of the modern view of what constitutes the American way. Is the much discussed American way for Christ or against Him? Is one fair to all religions by ignoring them all? Are all religions to be classed as silly or superstitious and of no real concern of the state? The real test of the American way is, Does it conform to the way of Jesus Christ?

Perhaps the most impressive symbol of what a nation can and ought to be is seen in that monument overlooking Plymouth Bay. It is a colossal statue resting on a granite base. The 4 corners of the base represent 4 great forces of national life—law, morality, freedom, and education. Above and over these forces stands the gigantic figure of Faith. With one hand she holds the open Bible, with the other she lifts a pointing finger to God.

This symbolizes what we are striving for in this Christian amendment.

When Uncle Sam, our Nation, gives supreme allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, and when we, the people of this Nation, hold in our hands the open Bible and cherish in our hearts a living faith in Christ, the Son of God, then our Nation will experience the blessing of that great promise, "Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord."

[From the Congressional Record, 82d Cong., 2d sess.]

THE FAITH OF GEORGE WASHINGTON—A SERMON BY BILLY GRAHAM

Extension of remarks of Hon. Wingate H. Lucas of Texas in the House of Representatives Monday, February 18, 1952

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, there has just been concluded here in Washington one of the most phenomenal evangelistic revivals in the history of America. I am speaking, of course, you know, of the famous Billy Graham crusade which has been filling to overflowing the great National Guard Armory for the last 5 weeks. Yesterday afternoon there were more than 15,000 worshipers who came to the final service in the campaign, many of whom had to stand outside in the cold and damp weather because of inadequate room in that giant auditorium.

We can never know, Mr. Speaker, the extent of the great good that has been accomplished by Mr. Graham and those who have been assisting him. We do know that 6,115 people penitently pledged themselves to Jesus Christ. No one could hear Mr. Graham without being moved spiritually by his compelling sermons and prayers.

I feel that Washington has been blessed, and that the entire Nation has been blessed, by the efforts of the Billy Graham team during this revival. In order that my fellow Members of Congress who did not have the privilege of hearing personally the great sermon Mr. Graham preached yesterday as the final appeal during this crusade, I am having it printed with these remarks:

"THE FAITH OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

"When President Roosevelt addressed Congress on January 4, 1939, he emphasized that the source of all democracy is religion. The outstanding thing about this address was the way in which newspaper columnists all over the country seized upon that one part of the President's address and commented on it.

"Mark Sullivan said: 'Men derive their liberties from God.' While Dorothy Thompson, quoting William Penn, said: 'Men will be governed by God, or they will be ruled by tyrants.'

"Ladies and gentlemen, this teaching is as old as the Bible itself. Three thousand years ago David wrote in the 23d Psalm: 'Blessed is the nation whose god is the Lord.' Many other verses teach that if a nation is to live, it must depend on God; and if it refuses, it will die.

" 'Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.'

" 'The wicked shall be turned into hell and all the nations that forget God.'

" 'For the nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted' (Isaiah 60:12).

" 'For the kingdom is the Lord's and He is a governor among the nations' (Psalm 22:28).

" 'And God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord' (Acts 17:26, 27).

"Our pilgrim forefathers believed this truth; the first thing they did in America was to dedicate their venture to God. The Mayflower compact, the first civil document drawn up on our shores, acknowledged God in these words: 'In the name of God, amen. We have undertaken for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith, do by these present solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one another covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body.'

"The compact of Rhode Island reads:

" 'We whose names are underwritten do hereby solemnly in the presence of God incorporate ourselves into a body, and as He shall help will submit our persons, lives, and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and to all those perfect laws of His given us in His holy word of truth to be judged and guided thereby.'

"Ladies and gentlemen, our Nation was founded upon God, religion, and the church. When the Constitutional Assembly met in 1787, it had been going for 5 weeks when Benjamin Franklin, the oldest man there, now 81 years of age, rose and made a motion that they ask God's help in prayer. Here is what Franklin said: 'Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks of close attendance and continual reasoning with each other is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. How has

it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illumine our understanding? I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, under sacred writings, that "except the Lord build a house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this, and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel.'

"This week we will celebrate the birthday of the Father of our Country. George Washington said in his first speech to the First Congress: 'Every step by which we have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency.' He also said in that same speech: 'Such being the impressions under which I have in obedience to the public summons repaired to the present station, it would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of the nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defeat.'

"Probably the two greatest Presidents in American history are Washington and Lincoln. The outstanding characteristic of both Washington and Lincoln was their absolute reliance on the God who answers prayer.

"Many of Washington's biographers stressed the point that when beset by trials and difficulties over which he had no control, he often had recourse to prayer as a way out. Particularly was this true of Valley Forge, where during the long hard winter of 1777 with his small army of ill-clothed, half-starved, freezing men, himself beset and hindered by the difficulties he suffered because of Congress, he carried the cause of the Nation to God. One writer gives us the following account: 'One afternoon as Isaac Potts, a miller at whose home General Washington made his headquarters, was strolling along a creek, he heard a voice which seemed to come from within the woods. He walked quietly in that direction and found the general's horse tied to a tree. Looking cautiously into a neighboring grove, he saw in the dim twilight the Commander in Chief upon his knees with face uplifted and his cheeks effused with tears. The miller stood spellbound for several minutes, then hastened home and told the incident to his wife, for he was as much agitated as though he had beheld something supernatural. The man who had been discovered in that solemn moment never knew that the incident would find its way into our country's history, for he did not dream that he had been seen, but the country of which he is the father knows that his prayer was answered.'

"On one occasion when a distinguished English visitor was visiting this country he asked Secretary Thompson: 'How shall I be able to recognize Mr. Washington?' Mr. Thompson replied: 'You can distinguish him when Congress goes to prayer. Mr. Washington is the gentleman who always kneels.'

"What a thrilling, glorious thing it would be to see the leaders of our country today kneeling before Almighty God in prayer. What a thrill would sweep this country. What renewed hope and courage would grip the Americans at this hour of peril.

"Abraham Lincoln once said to his friend, Judge Henry C. Whitney: 'I have been driven many times upon my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seemed insufficient for the day.'

"On the day the news of General Lee's surrender at Appomattox Courthouse was received, the Cabinet meeting was held an hour earlier than usual.

"Neither President Lincoln nor any member of the Cabinet was able for a time to give utterance to his feelings. At the suggestion of the President, all dropped on their knees and offered in silence and in tears their humble and heartfelt acknowledgment to God for the triumph He had granted to the national cause.

"There is no doubt in my mind that our problems today, as large as they loom, would be solved if our leaders and our people in the spirit of those two great Presidents would place their full reliance on God, depending as did Washington and Lincoln upon the power of prayer.

"I heard some time ago of a cartoon in which Uncle Sam, standing on the ship of state, turns and says to the representatives of the Christian faith: 'It is your business to keep off from the ship of state the barnacles of greed, selfishness, and dishonesty.' That was supposed to be a compliment to religion. It was to keep off the barnacles, but was to have nothing to say about the directing of the ship. This seems to be the common attitude today in America toward Christ

and the civil government. Christ is useful to help keep barnacles off the ship of state, but it would never do to let him take over the helm. Christ, through his men, directed the affairs of this Nation for many years and made us the great Nation that we are; but of late men have come to believe that religion has no place in the affairs of state. We are directing the ship of state unassisted by God, past the reefs and through the storms of time. We have dropped our pilot, the Lord Jesus Christ, and are sailing blindly on without divine chart or compass, hoping somehow to find our desired haven. We have certain leaders who are rank materialists; they do not recognize God nor care for Him; they spend their time in one round of parties after another. The Capital City of our Nation can have a great spiritual awakening, thousands coming to Jesus Christ, but certain leaders have not lifted an eyebrow, nor raised a finger, nor showed the slightest bit of concern.

"Ladies and gentlemen, I warn you, if this state of affairs continues, the end of the course is national shipwreck and ruin.

"When our convoys sailed to attack Sicily, General Eisenhower stood on the shore; he lifted his arm in a formal salute, then, bowing his head, he offered a silent prayer.

"Turning to one of his aides, the general said, 'Man can go so far.' For miles across the sea the storm raged, threatening our convoy. Suddenly the storm ceased and newsmen who accompanied those ships sent the word back to America: 'A miracle happened. Again our forces landed from a calm sea.'

"At Rabaul we lost only 17 planes while the Japanese lost over 1,000. General MacArthur said, 'God blessed our arms.' When he walked ashore at Leyte he said, 'God brought us back.'

"In Amos 4:12 God says, 'Prepare to meet thy God.' In this passage of scripture God is speaking to the nation Israel. Israel had been a sinful, wayward, law-breaking nation. God gave warning through his prophet Amos for Israel to repent of her sins or perish. God warned time after time through one prophet after another concerning the judgment of God.

"God was long suffering, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. He gave plenty of time for the nation to repent, but through the hardness of their hearts they refused to repent. One day the patience of God was exhausted, judgment struck, and Israel was destroyed.

"Today I sincerely believe that God is warning the American people, through the preaching of His word, to repent of sin and turn to God while there is time. It is true that God is a God of long suffering, love, and mercy, but God will not long abide our sins of materialism. We are a desperately wicked people, but God promises that—

"'If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land' (II Chronicles 7:14).

"I believe that this evangelistic campaign here in the Nation's Capital was sent by God at this particular time to give one more warning to the American people. It may be the last warning. I look out of my hotel window and I can see the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and the other magnificent structures here in this city, and yet sometimes in my mind's eye I see the crumbling and the falling of this city out yonder in the not-too-distant future unless it repents of its sins. The judgment of God is surely coming. Our Nation cannot survive. I give this warning to the American people from the depths of my heart, from a bleeding heart, from an agonizing heart, from a burdened heart, to repent before it is too late. 'Prepare to meet thy God.'"

The CHAIRMAN. Now we will take up those who are opposed to the constitutional amendment.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. Glenn L. Archer.

Is Mr. Archer here?

(No response.)

Dr. Howard?

Dr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, more important than anything I said in the lengthy statement is a part of the Constitution of the United States which has not been quoted in this hearing and which does not seem to be known by any of those who have been heard.

The statement over and over, as I have heard here, is that the Constitution makes no recognition of the liquor question and expresses

no opposition, all of which is a mistake because here at the end of the Constitution we read these words.

Will you please read them? This is a part of the Constitution of the United States adopted by the fathers with all of the members of the Constitutional Convention from Washington down signing the declaration.

Mr. SMITHEY (reading).

Done in Convention by the unanimous consent of the States present the 17th day of September in the year of our Lord 1787, and of the independence of the United States of America the 12th—

Dr. HOWARD. Stop right there. What does it say? Something about this "year of our Lord"? Who says the Lord is not recognized in the fundamental law of the land? It is there and the fathers put it there.

The only reason I speak in favor of the amendment proposed is that it is language there is a little more conclusive than the language stated there, but in the original document written by the fathers and signed by every member of the Constitutional Convention the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, as the rock of the Republic, is a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Rabbi, will you please proceed?

STATEMENT OF RABBI ISIDORE BRESLAU, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON BEHALF OF THE SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Rabbi BRESLAU. Mr. Chairman, I represent the Synagogue Council of America, which embraces all of the presently organized Jewish religious bodies in the United States. I am speaking on their behalf.

Reference was made earlier this afternoon to my resemblance to Houdini. I wished I possessed more of his actual talents so that I could shake out of my sleeve somehow an argument sufficiently strong to oppose the matter that has been put forward this afternoon.

Mr. Pfeffer and I have a task.

May I express at the outset this one word of caution: I do not believe that this discussion this afternoon should deteriorate—that is my evaluation of it—into a discussion as between Christian and Jew.

This is not a debate between Christian and Jew on a matter that affects the future and the life of the people of the United States. This is a discussion between one citizen and another with regard to something equally important to each of us. It has nothing to do with the fact that I am a Jew—I hope—or perhaps that you are a Christian.

Our convictions are as a result of our respective beliefs, but in this discussion here it is not a debate between Christian and Jew.

I am not unmindful of the fact many centuries ago during these dark Middle Ages some of these debates were highly unprofitable to 1 or 2 Jewish rabbis who had to face a hostile audience in a hostile court.

This belongs to the past and not to the present that is America.

I am grateful to Professor Coleman and Dr. McKnight for their expressions of friendship to our Jewish people and for the absence of anti-Semitic feeling in this discussion although I sometimes hope

that some of our good Christian friends would swap a little bit of that love for a little more of the understanding of it.

In my observations this afternoon with regard to this proposal, sir, I hope that they need not be interpreted as in any sense anti-Christian. That has nothing to do with it.

As a minority people we just have learned through the experience of 2,000 years, living among so-called Christian nations, that our ills and our persecutions have come not from good Christians, but from bad Christians.

And whatever good feeling we have had, every support we have had in our position everywhere else in the world, has been the support of men and women who have been good Christians.

I do not agree entirely with you, sir, that the future of the Jewish people depends on Christianity. But I do believe that those who profess the Jewish faith depend upon those who persist in their loyalty to profess their faith in the Jewish faith and the Christian's.

I would be the last person in the world to seek to have any citizen of our country be less Christian than he might possibly be. I wish he would fulfill his Christian duty to the highest and greatest potential.

You see what is happening here this afternoon, a discussion of the proposed amendment of the Constitution has gravitated to the level of a discussion between Christian and Jew, matters of religion.

If at the first instance, sir, when the matter is first being introduced and discussed, we already begin with this kind of argument and discussion, what will result and what may ensue in all the years to come when this should happen to become the law of the land and when Congress is asked to become the interpreter of that law?

Not only that, but the gentleman over here, Dr. Martin, said that the Congress and the courts of the United States will have to become the students of the Bible and have to determine on the basis of Biblical law what is right and what is not right.

With much of the argument that has been adduced this afternoon we are in complete agreement. We, too, believe that a godless people represent danger to the world. We do believe, too, that the more that religious teaching can be accepted in practice by the citizens the greater strength there is to our country.

Someone said—I forget whom—that our liberties come from God on high. I agree with that. Our liberty comes from God on high, and from nobody else.

Our difference is with respect to what to do about the situation.

Standing here, and I stand here designated as a Jew evidently, it would seem that I have a little more faith in our Christian belief than some of my good Christian friends have.

I do not believe, for one, that Jesus Christ requires a sanction—forgive me, sir—of a house of legislature of men of flesh and blood to give greater credence to His teachings or greater support to His gift to mankind, as you understand.

I believe along with Christians, and I think you ought to believe along with me, in our respective feelings we should have enough confidence in the kind of revelations each of us has received that through the other agencies at our disposal, the home, the school, the synagogue, and religious school, we shall be able to propagate the element of our

faith to the degree that we shall together and respectively develop a more intelligent and a more moral citizenship.

So, with much that has been said we are in agreement. Our only disagreement is with respect to whether this ought to be incorporated in the Constitution of the United States. For this it is well that we come with testimony, because we have shown what it has been to go through the experience of minority in a situation such as might develop here.

Forgive me, sir, if I refer once more to the religious argument that has developed. I pursue it only to emphasize again and again how dangerous it is.

You quoted Disraeli on the fact that we Jews should be beholden and grateful to the Christian world for their gifts and benefits. You must remember that when Disraeli said that he was already a Christian in faith and belief. I believe he was baptized as a child in the Christian faith. It is not unreasonable to expect him to recommend like action to others.

I might remind yourselves, sir, though, of the gift that Christianity owes to the Jew.

Mr. MARTIN. That is very fine.

Rabbi BRESLAU. And in this area we could debate and discuss ad infinitum. I do not believe that that kind of debate and discussion would add to the stability of our people and of our Government and to the proper relationship that ought to prevail between our citizens who happen to be members of different faiths.

I trust, therefore, that you will understand us when we say that we appear here in opposition to this resolution not in any sense of being anti-Christian and antireligious; we are just as much concerned about religion as you are. But because of our concern with what we believe to be the spirit and the philosophy of the American way of life.

We do have prepared a brief at some length. I am not going to read it all. I should like to enter it into the record. Mr. Pfeffer may refer to it later in his argument and discussion. But we believe that the adoption of such an amendment would be contrary to the spirit and to the philosophy of the American way of life. It would create a status of second-class citizenship for a portion of our population and it would create another area of segregation, sir, another area of segregation as between citizen and citizen, depending upon his acceptance or his nonacceptance of the divinity of your Lord Jesus Christ.

It seems to be our purpose in the American system to work for the diminution of such areas of segregation and not for the creation of new ones. It seems to be the purpose in our American way of life to look for a further and stronger integration of the various elements of our community into one unity and not to create instances with the differences that are emphasized.

In the third provision of this proposal reference is made that the Congress may legislate, may make provision for an oath suitable to those who could not accept the first part of the resolution. I wonder if Congress in its wisdom does not desire legislation, what kind of oath can I as a Jew subscribe to? Congress does not always legislate things that the Constitution makes provision for. Congress sometimes thinks it wise enough to form its own judgment. I can see how a

devout and good Christian Congress may at any time say, "In our judgment there are those people who do not believe in the divinity of Christ and we should not give them the privilege of taking an oath." It has happened before in other lands and in other governments.

I would rather trust the judgment and the sense of morality in the Christian church and the Christian teachers and Christian schools than to leave that decision to a politically selected Congress that often acts under all kinds of pressures.

I have more faith in men like you, sir, in our Nation, than I have in some Members of our Congress, and I trust the Senator will forgive me.

The CHAIRMAN. Say anything you want. You do not hurt my feelings a bit.

Rabbi BRESLAU. May I say I find all the more difficult to rise here and speak in this fashion, particularly since I find my very good friend, Mr. Howard, on the other side of the issue, the man in Washington whom I have long respected and whom I have long considered my friend.

I do not wish to read this whole brief which will be filed with you, sir, but since the memory of George Washington seems to have been invoked more than any other in support of the proposition here presented, may I also turn to the Father of our Country for his testimony. George Washington wrote to the members of the synagogue in Newport, R. I., in 1789 as follows:

Happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effective support. * * * May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid.

In this letter Washington expressed the spirit of the new nation which proposed that men should be completely equal before the law without any distinction as to religious affiliation or doctrinal conviction.

Since the founding of the United States of America and the adoption of the Federal Constitution, Jews have been full citizens of the United States and have given their wholehearted and unqualified support to the Constitution. It is now proposed that a fundamental principle of American life be repudiated and that 5 million Jews—to say nothing of the many other non-Christian Americans—be reduced to a status of second-class citizens.

As a religious people devoted to the doctrines of Judaism, Jews cannot in good conscience recognize "the law and authority of Jesus Christ" as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 87. Every Jew would consider it an act of religious discrimination if he were deprived of the right to give wholehearted and unqualified allegiance to every sentence of the American Constitution and for conscience' sake be compelled to make the slightest reservation in taking an oath of allegiance.

We believe that the Constitution of the United States is for every one of us. I want to be as much of that Constitution as any other citizen in the United States. I believe my present Constitution gives me that right. I do not want to owe my allegiance to only part of that Constitution. It is all mine, as much as it is all yours.

When I am asked to take an oath in support of my Constitution I do not want to take that oath with any kind of reservation, and this kind of amendment would compel me to do it.

It is wholly possible that the insertion into the fundamental law of the United States of an explicit affirmation of Christian doctrine would not be permitted to remain as a mere gesture. For the next stage might well be the introduction by legislative action of instruction in Christian doctrine into the curriculum of the public schools or the imposition of religious tests for the exercise of the various rights of citizenship.

I believe all you gentlemen are sincere in what you say, that you believe in setting up sufficient supports against the violation of these principles. You believe, but I hesitate to trust my future and the future of my children to men who might come after you who might believe otherwise.

It has been said in passing that the Jews suffered at great length over the centuries because of their rejection of Jesus Christ. I refuse to accept that statement. I refuse to believe that God was involved in any sense in the murder of 6 million Jews by Hitler and by people who once believed themselves to be a Christian nation. I do not believe that was God's will.

So I do not know how I can face the future with confidence if I have to trust once more men, fallible men, with what may be to me and my children a matter of life and death. That is the reason I believe under the Constitution I and every other citizen should have equal rights with equal responsibilities, no more and no less.

Such proposals as this are not new in American history. They have been repeatedly rejected despite the fact that the great majority of American citizens are of Christian faith, because it was recognized that to adopt such a policy would be to depart from that broad and untrammelled freedom which has made it possible for men of all religions to work together in the building of the world's greatest democracy.

Has it ever occurred to you what has been the secret of America's greatness? Why have we escaped the great turmoil and bitterness that has enveloped all the European Continent in the last century? Why have we had so little of that grief ourselves? Has it not been the fact that we have kept out of our political life all these disputations on matters of religion? We have let every man's conscience be free and we have urged him to use his own conscience, to make his own moral decisions, so that the collective decisions of a whole citizenry may be of the kind that will advance the interest of the whole citizenry. That has been the secret of our America. I believe we ought to keep it that way.

It can be safely stated that every American Jew will pray fervently to the God of his fathers that this proposal will not be accepted, for should it be adopted this country will not longer be the America we have been known till now.

In a few months the Jews of the United States will celebrate the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in North America. Back in 1654 the first little company of Jews arrived from the Caribbean area to what is now New York City, then New Amsterdam. This is an occasion to which we have looked forward with the greatest pride and enthusiasm as a means of reaffirming our full identity with the

land through which we have been so greatly blessed and to the development of which we have contributed in no small degree. It is our prayer that this 300th anniversary will be celebrated as an occasion of deep and spiritual joy and particularly because that joy is made possible or can be made possible because of the equality we enjoy as American citizens before the law and before all of our fellow citizens.

For these reasons, sir, and for others that may be advanced by Mr. Pfeffer we respectfully present our opposition to Resolution 87.

The CHAIRMAN. Call the next witness.

Mr. SMITHEY. Mr. Leo Pfeffer.

STATEMENT OF LEO PFEFFER, COUNSEL FOR SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA AND NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. PFEFFER. Senator Langer, and gentlemen, I hesitate to impose upon your time at this late hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Do not worry about the hour now. You take all the time you want. I do not have a thing to do the rest of the evening.

Mr. PFEFFER. I assure you notwithstanding your patience I would be reluctant to do so were this not a matter which affects deeply the 5 million Jews for whom I speak.

The organizations for which I submit this statement represent the overwhelming majority of the Jews of American Jewry. With one or another of these various organizations practically every Jew in this country is affiliated.

Senator Langer, many of my colleagues here, my friends, have spoken with evangelical persuasion. I am reminded of an instance, too. I would like to point out that I am very friendly to the evangelicals and some of my best friends are evangelicals.

One of my friends I met recently I asked his opinion of the new standard revised version of the Bible. He said with a smile, "I will take the Bible as God gave it."

Senator Langer, I think we ought to take the Constitution as our constitutional fathers gave it. It has been pretty good for 160 years or so. I think it will last another 160 years without basic amendment.

This is not a new proposal, as was pointed out. This is not a new proposal at all. Ever since our country was founded, ever since our Constitution was adopted, and even before, there had been attempts to incorporate into the basic document an invocation to Jesus Christ.

As a matter of fact, the antecedents of the constitutional guaranty of religious liberty come from Thomas Jefferson's great statute of liberty which was adopted in Virginia, and Thomas Jefferson relates that during the time this statute, this bill, was being considered by the legislature an attempt was made to incorporate in it an invocation to Jesus Christ. Thomas Jefferson relates in his notes on Virginia that this was rejected by a great majority in proof that they meant to comprehend within the mantle of its protection the Jew and the Gentile, the Christian, Mohammedan, the Hindu, the infidel of every denomination.

I think the Legislature of Virginia and Thomas Jefferson sought to encompass under the mantle of the Virginia statute of religious liberty the Jew as well as the Gentile.

I think that when the fathers of our country adopted this constitution in 1789 they meant to encompass under the mantle of its protection the Jew as well as the Gentile.

I would be very reluctant to believe that my very worthy and esteemed Christian friend would want to cast us out, 5 million of us, from the mantle of the protection of our Constitution.

The proposal contains an escape clause, something to protect or to prevent the discrimination, at least so the proponents contend. They say that Congress may make suitable provisions to provide a suitable oath for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as amended.

I wonder if those who drafted this amendment realized what they are saying. They limit the authority to Congress to make this provision, this exemption to citizens. Until a person takes an oath of allegiance he is not a citizen. You become a citizen when you take your oath of allegiance. Therefore Congress could not provide that an applicant for citizenship may take an oath different from this; only the citizen. That is what it says.

The result is that if a Jew were not a citizen and sought to become a citizen of this great country, he would either have to give up his religion or have to give up his desire to become a citizen.

That, too, Senator Langer, is not unique. For many years in our country in the 18th century no Catholic could become a citizen unless he took an oath of allegiance to abjure any allegiance to a foreign potentate, civil or ecclesiastical, which meant he had to relinquish his religious allegiance to the Pope. He had to give up his Catholicism or give up his desire to become a citizen.

Fortunately, the commonsense, the fairness, the decency of the American people came to the fore and they one by one eliminated this prohibition. So it is no longer necessary for a Catholic in order to become a citizen to give up his Catholicism.

This amendment would make it necessary for a Jew to give up his Judaism should he want to become a citizen of this great country.

Mr. SMITHEY. Could that be changed by the insertion of the word "person" in lieu of the word "citizen"?

Mr. PFEFFER. I am bringing this not to indicate that this is the only thing wrong with it. I am merely indicating this amendment which has been pushed for so many years has not been carefully thought out, has not been drafted with the realization of the persons involved, the interests involved.

Let me go on. After the Virginia statute was adopted and the provision for an invocation to Jesus Christ was eliminated at the urging of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, the constitutional fathers met to draft a constitution and as Elliott's Debates points out, there was a good deal of criticism then because there was no invocation to Jesus Christ in the Constitution. As a matter of fact, Philip Schaff points out in his excellent book Church and State in the United States there were a group of Presbyterians who took an oath they would never vote for any officer of the United States until the Constitution was amended to invoke Jesus Christ. Fortunately they either forgot about their oath or they obtained absolution because they presumably undertook their obligations of citizens.

But when these questions arose in the various State legislatures, when one after another said "Don't you think that in view of the fact

that the overwhelming majority of Americans are Christians," at that time, Senator Langer, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the citizens who were residents of the United States were Jews, there were barely 2,000 out of 4 million persons who were Jews, a mere infinitesimal fragment, yet the spirit of Thomas Jefferson prevailed in every one of these cases. They said it matters not if, in matters of religion and faith, 100 million believe one way and 1 believes another. Under our system of separation of church and state, of complete religious freedom, the religious freedom of the other 1 is as sacred in the eyes of the law as the beliefs of the 100 million.

One of my adversaries has suggested that if you violate the law against speeding even though you are a minority you must abide by it. True enough; but the laws against speeding are secular laws, they are laws which a government in its police power has the right to enact.

But if America means anything it means that the ways a man worships his God, the relationship between an individual and his Maker, are something which are not subject to laws, are not subject to governmental control. That is what Congress said. That is what the constitutional fathers said when they established that there shall be no religious test.

That, too, is the subject of criticism. It is contained in our statement. It might mean that an atheist might become the President of the United States or, even worse, a Jew. But the fathers of our Constitution said that the system which we have created, the experiment we are undergoing encompasses a complete independence of religion and government, that government may not use its power to coerce, to influence, to force anybody into a particular religion.

Senator Langer, there are many things the United States has to be proud of, but I think nothing that the United States has done compares as a contribution to western civilization with the launching of the unique experiment of absolute and complete separation of church and state and complete religious freedom. That was unique. That never existed before 1789. Nobody had conceived of the idea outside of the United States that the prince, the king, the parliament, does not have power to tell a man how he shall worship or when he shall worship or for whom he shall worship. This was a unique experiment which was articulated in the first amendment that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

It was something unheard of before, but it was a great experiment. It was an experiment founded upon thousands of years of experience. Each one of our constitutional fathers knew well the persecution, the oppression, the hatred, the bitterness, the religious wars which had occurred in Europe, in vain attempts to enforce religious uniformity.

Madison stated at the time of the adoption of the Constitution :

Torrents of blood have been spilled in the world in vain attempts of the titular arm to extinguish religious discord by proscribing all difference in religious opinion.

The United States Supreme Court in various cases have pointed this out. In *The People v. The Board of Education* (330 U. S. 1), the Supreme Court of the United States pointed out the whole history of suppression and persecution which preceded the first amendment and said our fathers were convinced that the only way to avoid these in this country, to prevent these horrible things, was forever to es-

tablish a strict separation of church and state, was forever to remove from the jurisdiction of the secular authorities, from the governmental authorities, the jurisdictional matters of religion. So they said that Congress shall make no law respecting any establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

This is not new. A report was issued on it way back in 1874. The National Reform Association, which is behind the present proposal, submitted a proposal then. A House committee reported on it. Let me read from the House Judiciary Committee's report unanimously recommending the rejection of the proposal. They reported:

That upon examination even of the meager debates of the fathers of the Republic in the Convention which framed the Constitution, they find that the subject of this memorial was most fully and carefully considered, and then, in that Convention, decided, after grave deliberation, to which the subject was entitled, that, as this country, the foundation of whose Government they were then laying, was to be the home of the oppressed of all nations of the earth, whether Christian or pagan, and in full realization of the dangers which the union between church and state had imposed upon so many nations of the Old World, with great unanimity that it was inexpedient to put anything into the Constitution or frame of Government which might be construed to be a reference to any religious creed or doctrine.

It was unanimously rejected. It was tried again and again and again and again over a period of well over a hundred years. Each time it was rejected; sometimes, as in this case, with a formal report. Other times merely by passing it over.

That was no accident, Mr. Chairman; that was no accident. It was realized implicitly that a proposal such as this is basically alien to the American tradition. It is basically inconsistent with that of fair play, decency, equality which underlies our American constitutional system.

I am sure I would be less than fair if I did not acknowledge that I have no doubt as to the honesty, the integrity, and the sincerity of the gentlemen and the organizations which are pushing for this proposal. Yet in a convention that there is but one road to salvation and that there is but one truth which all must adhere to and that religious differences must be removed, there is frequently an inability to place one's self in the position of the other, of the one who is in the minority, of the one who does not believe, and there is no doubt that they are acting out of love. I am sure that they bear no ill will to the Jewish people. Yet, I point out that our people before Hitler suffered the greatest oppression and persecution in our history out of love. We suffered through the Inquisition. Our people suffered out of love because the Christian members of the Inquisition, the Christian rulers, were convinced that only through our conversion to Christianity would we ever be saved and if we would not be converted peacefully we would be burned. There was no doubt that the Inquisition was based upon love.

As many facetiously pointed out, Heaven protect me from my friends, I will take care of my enemies. We urge that you must assume that the Jewish people have a feeling of responsibility as to their own welfare, that while you may act in what you deem to be friendly action, in a way you may deem to be saving us, you may deem that you are showing us the true life; nevertheless God has given us the right to make a choice and the Constitution of the United States has protected that right to make our choice voluntarily, to choose whether we

will go this way or that way, to choose whether we will believe in 1 god, 2 gods, or 10 gods, or in no god at all; to choose whether we believe in Moses or Jesus; to choose whether we worship in a church or synagogue; to choose whether we refrain from work on Saturday or Sunday. God has given that right. The Constitution has secured that right. Do not take that great God-given and American-protected right away from us.

Therefore I urge not that the committee reject this proposal—I think it will, I think it is consistent with its whole history that it will—but I urge primarily that in friendship and fellowship and in the consistency of true faith and true honesty and devotion to both God and the Constitution of the United States, that the proponents withdraw it.

(The prepared statement submitted by the Synagogue Council of America is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF THE SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA AND THE NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL IN OPPOSITION TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 87

1. WHOM WE REPRESENT

This statement is submitted in behalf of the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 87.

The Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council are coordinating agencies for the organizations representing the orthodox, conservative, and reform branches of Jewish life and national, regional, State, and local Jewish communal civic organizations as follows:

Central Conference of American Rabbis
 Rabbinical Assembly of America
 Rabbinical Council of America
 Union of American Hebrew Congregations
 Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America
 United Synagogue of America
 American Jewish Congress
 Jewish Labor Committee
 Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America
 Jewish Welfare Fund of Akron
 Jewish Community Relations Council for Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, Calif.
 Baltimore Jewish Council.
 Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Boston
 Jewish Community Council, Bridgeport, Conn.
 Brooklyn Jewish Community Council
 Community Relations Committee of the Jewish Federation of Camden County, N. J.
 Cincinnati Jewish Community Council
 Jewish Community Federation, Cleveland, Ohio
 Connecticut Jewish Community Relations Council
 Detroit Jewish Community Council
 Elizabeth, N. J., Jewish Community Council
 Jewish Community Council of Essex County, N. J.
 Community Relations Committee of the Hartford (Conn.) Jewish Federation
 Indiana Jewish Community Relations Council
 Indianapolis Jewish Community Relations Council
 Community Relations Bureau of the Jewish Federation and Council of Greater Kansas City
 Community Relations Committee of the Los Angeles Jewish Community Council
 Milwaukee Jewish Council
 Minnesota Jewish Council
 New Haven Jewish Community Council
 Norfolk Jewish Community Council
 Philadelphia Jewish Community Relations Council
 Jewish Community Relations Council, Pittsburgh

Jewish Community Council, Rochester
 San Diego Jewish Community Relations Council
 Jewish Community Relations Council of St. Louis
 Jewish Community Council of Toledo
 Southwestern Jewish Community Relations Council
 San Francisco Jewish Community Relations Council
 Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington (D. C.)
 Jewish Community Relations Council of the Jewish Federation of Youngstown,
 Ohio

The overwhelming proportion of the Jewish population of the United States is affiliated with these constituent organizations of the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council.

2. SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 87

Senate Joint Resolution 87 was introduced by Senator Ralph Flanders, of Vermont, and reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of Nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.

"SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power in such cases as it may deem proper to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

3. THE BACKGROUND

This resolution is not new. It has a long history behind it.

Even before our Constitution was enacted the State of Virginia enacted Thomas Jefferson's great Statute of Religious Freedom. When that measure was being considered by the Virginia Legislature an attempt was made to amend it so as to include a reference to Jesus Christ. Jefferson, in his autobiography, relates the incident in the following language:

"The bill for establishing religious freedom, the principles of which had, to a certain degree, been enacted before, I had drawn in all the latitude of reason and right. It still met with opposition; but, with some mutilations in the preamble, it was finally passed; and a singular proposition proved that its protection of opinion was meant to be universal. Where the preamble declares that coercion is a departure from the plan of the holy author of our religion, an amendment was proposed, by inserting the words 'Jesus Christ,' so that it should read, 'a departure from the plan of Jesus Christ, the holy author of our religion'; the insertion was rejected by a great majority, in proof that they meant to comprehend, within the mantle of its protection, the Jew and the gentile, the Christian and the Mahometan, the Hindoo, the infidel of every denomination."

When our Constitution was being written a minority of sectarian voices demanded inclusion of a reference to Jesus Christ. Omission of a reference to Christ in the Constitution was bitterly criticized by a few church groups during the debates in the States at the time ratification of the Constitution was being considered. Indeed, two Presbyterian Church groups resolved not to vote at elections until the Constitution should be amended to acknowledge the sovereignty of Christ. (Philip Schaff, *Church and State in the United States*, p. 433.)

In 1863 representatives from a number of Protestant denominations organized the National Reform Association, the organization which is now behind Senate Joint Resolution 87. One of the principal purposes of the National Reform Association was "to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniably legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." Ever since then the National Reform Association has been diligent in its efforts to amend the Constitution so as to include an invocation to Jesus Christ.

The leaders of the National Reform Association have no doubts as to what they want. According to one, "The existence of a Christian constitution would disfranchise every logical consistent infidel." Another has argued that just as

"constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and, of course, Congress establishes a standard for money, weights, and measures, so Congress must establish a standard of religion." The historian of the national reform movement has suggested that if the Christian amendment were adopted, those who "do not seek to fall in with the majority * * * must abide the consequences, or seek some more congenial clime." (David McAllister, *the National Reform Movement*, p. 16; *American State Papers on Freedom and Religion*, p. 237.)

4. THE AMERICAN TRADITION

Every one of these attempts to include in our Constitution an invocation to Jesus Christ was defeated, thus establishing clearly that the proposal is completely alien to the American tradition of religious freedom and absolute separation of church and state. The fathers of our Constitution launched a great experiment in human history—a Nation founded upon the concept that religion is beyond the scope of secular government. David Dudley Field, one of America's great jurists, said of this experiment:

"The greatest achievement ever made in the cause of human progress is the total and final separation of church and state. If we had nothing else to boast of, we could lay claim with justice that first among the nations we of this country made it an article of organic law that the relations between man and his Maker were a private concern, into which other men have no right to intrude. To measure the stride thus made for the emancipation of the race, we have dreadful persecutions in the name of religion that have filled the world." (*American Progress in Jurisprudence*, p. 6.)

Because of the total and final separation of church and state and because the relation between a man and his Maker are a private concern, these ever-repeated efforts to invoke Jesus in the Constitution have until now failed. Not one of the 48 constitutions of our States contains such an invocation. When the issue was presented in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, the proposal was decisively defeated. When it was again raised in the States in the ratification debates, it was again everywhere defeated.

Thus, in a number of States the fear was expressed that the omission opened a door for Jews, Turks, and infidels. In Connecticut, Oliver Ellsworth, later Chief Justice of the United States, replied:

"The business of civil government is to protect the citizen in his rights, to defend the community from hostile powers, and to promote the general welfare. Civil government has no business to meddle with the private opinion of the people" (Edward F. Humphrey, *Nationalism and Religion in America, 1774-78*, pp. 463-464).

In Massachusetts, the Baptist leader, Isaac Backus, defended the omission on the ground that "nothing is more evident both in reason and the Holy Scriptures that religion is ever a matter between God and individuals" (Elliott, *Debates of the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution*, vol. 2, pp. 118-119). A fellow delegate who was a minister in the established Congregational Church agreed on the ground that "God alone is the God of conscience, and, consequently, attempts to erect human tribunals for the conscience of men, are improper encroachments upon the prerogatives of God" (*ibid.*, pp. 148-149).

In North Carolina it was argued that while it was possible that the people may "choose representatives who have no religion at all * * * how is it possible to exclude any set of men, without taking away that principle of religious freedom which we ourselves so warmly contend for * * *. It would be happy for mankind of religion was permitted to take its own course, and maintain itself by the excellence of its own doctrines. The divine Author of our religion never wishes for its support by worldly authority * * *. It made greater progress for itself than when supported by the greatest authority upon earth." To this Governor Johnston added that it would have been dangerous if Congress could intermeddle with the subject of religion (*ibid.*, vol. 4, pp. 195-200).

These expressions manifested a widespread if not universal assumption that the new National Government had no power to intermeddle with religion in any way. As Madison forcefully put it, the Constitution was not to create a shadow of right in the general Government to intermeddle with religion (*ibid.*, p. 122; vol. 5, p. 132).

Shortly after the new Nation was established pursuant to this principle, the meaning of this new principle was given practical effect in the treaty between the United States and the Government of Tripoli. In 1797, during the adminis-

tration of President John Adams, a treaty was entered between these two Governments which provided:

"As the Government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion; as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquillity of Musselmen * * * it is declared * * * that no pretext arising from religious opinion shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries" (American State Papers on Freedom and Religion, pp. 311-312).

In 1874 the House Judiciary Committee considered a proposal of the National Reform Association similar to Senate Joint Resolution 87 now before this committee. The House Judiciary Committee unanimously recommended that the proposal be rejected in the following language:

"That, upon examination even of the meager debates of the fathers of the Republic in the convention which framed the Constitution, they find that the subject of this memorial was most fully and carefully considered, and then, in that convention, decided, after grave deliberation, to which the subject was entitled, that, as this country, the foundation of whose government they were then laying, was to be the home of the oppressed of all nations of the earth, whether Christian or pagan, and in full realization of the dangers which the union between church and state had imposed upon so many nations of the Old World, with great unanimity that it was inexpedient to put anything into the Constitution or frame of government which might be construed to be a reference to any religious creed or doctrine" (ibid., pp. 252-253).

Because the fathers of our Republic sought forever to keep from our shores the sectarian conflicts, persecution bitterness, and religious warfare which plagued the Old World for centuries, they established the new Nation on the principle that church and state shall forever be separate and that religion shall ever be a matter between a man and his conscience. Senate Joint Resolution 87 represents a grave danger to this principle. It threatens to undermine the foundation of our democracy and to bring upon the American people the very evils which the constitutional fathers sought to prevent when they decreed in the opening words of the Bill of Rights, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." As James Madison, the father of our Constitution, said in 1784: "Torrents of blood have been spilled in the world in vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord by proscribing all difference in religious opinion" (James H. Blau, Cornerstone of Religious Freedom in America, p. 85).

5. THE THREAT TO AMERICAN JEWRY

George Washington wrote to the members of the synagogue in Newport, R. I., in the year 1789, as follows: "Happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effective support. * * * May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid." In this letter Washington expressed the spirit of the new Nation which proposed that men should be completely equal before the law without any distinction as to religious affiliation or doctrinal conviction.

Since the founding of the United States of America and the adoption of the Federal Constitution, Jews have been full citizens of the United States and have given their wholehearted and unqualified support to the Constitution. It is now proposed that a fundamental principle of American life be repudiated and that 5 million Jews (to say nothing of the many other non-Christian Americans) be reduced to a status of second-class citizens.

As a religious people devoted to the doctrines of Judaism, Jews cannot in good conscience recognize the law and authority of Jesus Christ as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 87. Every Jew would consider it an act of religious discrimination if he were deprived of the right to give wholehearted and unqualified allegiance to every sentence of the American Constitution and for conscience' sake be compelled to make the slightest reservation in taking an oath of allegiance. Beyond this we see additional dangers. It is wholly possible that the insertion into the fundamental law of the United States of an explicit affirmation of Christian doctrine would not be permitted to remain a mere gesture. Next stages might well be the introduction by legislative action of instruction in Christian

doctrine into the curriculum of the public schools or the imposition of religious tests for the exercise of the various rights of citizenship. However, even if such consequences did not result, it must be emphasized that the very existence of such a clause in a constitutional amendment would be a challenge to the faith of every believing Jew.

Such proposals as this are not new in American history. They have been repeatedly rejected despite the fact that the great majority of American citizens are of Christian faith because it was recognized that to adopt such a policy would be to depart from that broad and untrammelled freedom which has made it possible for men of all religions to work together in the building of the world's greatest democracy. It can be safely stated that every American Jew will pray fervently to the God of his fathers that this proposal will not be accepted, for should it be adopted, this country will not long be the America we have known till now.

In a few months the Jews of the United States will celebrate the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in North America. This is an occasion to which we have looked forward with the greatest pride and enthusiasm as a means of reaffirming our full identity with the land through which we have been so greatly blessed and to the development of which we have contributed in no small degree. It is our prayer that this 300th anniversary will be celebrated as an occasion of deep and spiritual joy and will not be turned into an occasion of sorrow because of the specter of the proposal now under consideration by this committee.

For these reasons we respectfully urge this committee to disapprove Senate Joint Resolution 87.

Respectfully submitted.

Rabbi ISADORE BRESLAU.

LEO PFEFFER,

*Counsel for Synagogue Council of America
and National Community Relations Advisory Council.*

The CHAIRMAN. Will you call the next witness?

Mr. SMITHEY. Dr. George E. Beauchamp.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes the list of witnesses for today's hearing. I do have some statements here which the committee has received for inclusion in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. They may be included.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

POAU STATEMENT SUBMITTED ON MAY 12, 1954, TO SENATOR LANGER, CHAIRMAN,
SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Senate Joint Resolution 87 proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ—an amendment which would, if adopted, virtually repeal the first amendment to the Constitution. After disavowing, in section 2, any intention of setting up a religious establishment, the proposed new amendment makes a gesture in section 3 toward those citizens "whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended." Under this section, non-Christians would be placed under the stigma of having to be excused by Congress from subscribing wholeheartedly to the Constitution, and would obviously be reduced to second-class citizens. Such an amendment would work a revolution in the American way of life, which was founded upon the principle that all citizens are equal before the law. As James Madison, father of the Constitution, put it: "Religion is not within the purview of human government." This philosophy, more than anything else, set the United States apart from the Old World tyrannies and made our Nation the harbinger of a new and better life for all mankind. The adoption of the amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 87 would set the clock back by centuries and lose for America her coveted role of civilized leadership.

GLENN L. ARCHER,

*Executive Director, Protestants and Other Americans United for
Separation of Church and State.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 17, 1954.

CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of League for Safeguarding Fixity of the Sabbath, embracing 61 national and central Jewish organizations, and on behalf of the Kehillah (Jewish community) of New York City, we protest adoption of any constitutional amendment or law such as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 87 incorporating recognition of authority and law of Jesus Christ. However qualified, such amendment would render Christianity a preferred religion and all other religions would be merely tolerated as second-class religions and, as in recent years, may involve destruction of life and property by fanatical observers of Christian religion. We regard it as threat undermining foundation of our democracy, introducing evils United States Founding Fathers were eager to prevent, such as persecutions and religious wars which, for more than millenium, brought strife to Europe and which the early colonists ran away from.

We submit (by special delivery) briefs, etc., showing conclusively Founding Fathers, Presidents from George Washington, all held United States not Christian nation and not in any sense founded upon Christian principles, to enable also nonreligious to fight for America and American democracy. Early colonization of United States due to America's being open for maintaining of religious freedom guaranteed by 1st and 14th amendments and by interpretation by unanimous decisions of United States Supreme Court that Constitution protects equally believers and nonbelievers.

In Declaration of Independence Thomas Jefferson incorporated basic statement: "All men created equal," endowed by Creator with what Washington later referred to as man's "inherent natural rights." Five of early colonies refused to sign proposed United States Constitution because it lacked specific provision for religious freedom guaranteed to every individual. Until assured such provision would be contained in Bill of Rights subsequently to be adopted, one State, refusing accept promise, withheld signing Constitution until Bill of Rights adopted. Jefferson was angry at omission in Constitution of affirmative provision guaranteeing religious freedom until Bill of Rights adopted and provision made for free exercise of religion, prohibiting Congress and the States, by the 1st and 14th amendments, from adopting law curtailing any rights to religious freedom or intruding within exclusive jurisdiction of religious bodies, and in accordance therewith, such provision was made in unanimous decision written by Chief Justice Waite in *Reynolds v. United States* (98 U. S. 145).

In *McCullum v. Board of Education* (333 U. S. 203), citing case of *Everson v. Board of Education* (330 U. S. 1), United States Supreme Court unanimously decided: "Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. * * *

"In words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect wall of separation between church and state, which United States Supreme Court held must be kept 'high and impregnable.' United States Presidents, beginning with George Washington, and the United States Senate, in official acts, in treaties with a Mohammedan nation, declared "the Government of United States is not in any sense founded on Christian religion."

In his monumental works, *American Commonwealth*, Ambassador Bryce said: "All religious bodies are absolutely equal before the law, and unrecognized by the law, except as voluntary associations of private citizens." And he adds, "Half of the wars of Europe, half the internal troubles that vexed the European States from the 5th century down to the 'kulturkampf' in the German Empire of the 19th have arisen from the theological differences from the rival claims of church and state."

What an example of intolerance to force down the throats of the many religious and nonreligious groups in the United States the beliefs and tenets of one particular group. Actions as in the past caused the burning alive at stake of tens of thousands of human beings after being tortured by the thumbscrew rack and other devilish devices for refusing to accept Christianity and for adhering to the first of God's Ten Commandments given at Mount Sinai, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

Proposed amendment or law will lead to greatest destructive disunity of all groups constituting American people now united in opposition to threat of communism to American democracy by revolutionary means brought about by

inciting group against group in United States. Adoption of United States Constitution made us a united people. The resolution proposed will destroy such unity.

LEAGUE FOR SAFEGUARDING FIXITY OF THE
SABBATH,
WILLIAM LIEBERMAN, *Honorary Chairman.*
ISSAC ROSENGARTEN, *Secretary.*
KEHILLAH JEWISH COMMUNITY OF NEW
YORK CITY,
WILLIAM LIEBERMAN, *President.*
JOSEPH SCHLANG, *Secretary.*

THE AMERICAN ETHICAL UNION,
New York, N. Y., May 15, 1954.

Mr. JOSEPH DAVIS,
Chief Clerk, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building, Room 424, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: In view of the serious implications of the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator Flanders, I have authorized Dr. George E. Beauchamp to represent the American Ethical Union at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on May 17. Dr. Beauchamp is leader, Washington Ethical Society, and leader-adviser, public affairs committee, American Ethical Union. If arrangements can be made for his attendance on such short notice, this will serve to introduce him and he will supplement this letter. If he cannot arrange to appear then this communication must speak for the American Ethical Union in a matter which deeply concerns the right of each individual to his personal interpretation of the meaning of life.

We are informed that section I of the proposed amendment reads as follows: "This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of Nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God." If the above wording is correct, we must then ask what purpose is to be served by such an amendment? Will it serve the interest of national unity or will it prove to be just another attempt to legislate theology?

We believe that approval of this amendment will introduce a religious division in our Nation by committing it to a specific Christian theology. The Founding Fathers who wrote our Constitution believed in separation of church and state and were careful not to invite such a controversy when their purpose was to achieve unity. I recall a note to the Government of Tripoli in the early 1800's which made it clear that our young Nation was in no sense founded upon the Christian religion.

We believe that one can recognize the good intent behind this amendment without considering the method either appropriate or effective. It seems that the proposed constitutional amendment is an unnecessary affront to many individuals and groups in our national life. I refer to those who are deeply religious without subscribing to the Christian theology to which this amendment would legally commit our Nation. It seems folly to impose these narrowly religious views by implication upon other nations of the world which are by majority non-Christian. There are many to date who are concerned about the present level of ethical relations in public and private life. One can understand the temptation to legislate morals, particularly by those who believe that morals are dependent upon a particular theological doctrine. Yet this inevitably leads to legislating theology and we ask this committee to resist this temptation in the interest of national unity. We believe that wisdom dictates, that legislators center their concern about legislation in the interest of all of the people and leave theology to the theologians.

The American Ethical Union is a national federation of ethical societies. These societies are religious and educational fellowships which interpret religion as man's quest for values worthy of his supreme allegiance. We believe that the search for ethical values and their progressive realization are inherently a religious enterprise. The proposed constitutional amendment would assume that such a quest is needless since all necessary religious authority and moral codes have been revealed in Christian theology.

Members of the ethical movement have become increasingly concerned over the tendency of many in public life and particularly in government to equate both personal morality and patriotism with Christian religious orthodoxy. We do not believe that morality is based upon adherence to a particular religious

dogma nor do we consider that better people can be developed by decrees or incantations. It is pertinent to this proposed amendment to call attention to, and make a part of this communication, the attached resolution passed unanimously by the delegates to the 47th national assembly, American Ethical Union, meeting in St. Louis, Mo., April 28 to May 2, 1954.

In closing, may I point out the relevance to your committee deliberations of a recent news item? It stated that Mr. Charles P. Taft heads a committee of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in protest to the Government of Colombia, regarding changes in its constitution which would narrow the religious base there to the detriment of Protestantism. Let us not do at home what we protest abroad.

Sincerely yours,

L. D. MACINTYRE,
President.

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S CONFERENCE, RECOMMENDED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY DELEGATES IN PLENARY SESSION, 1954 NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, AMERICAN ETHICAL UNION, ST. LOUIS, MO., ON APRIL 29, 1954

Whereas this Nation is composed of individuals of diverse racial, cultural, and religious backgrounds, each entitled to equal protection and freedom of thought under the Constitution; and

Whereas many patriotic Americans are not affiliated with traditional religious groups, yet conscientiously endeavor to lead good and purposeful lives; and

Whereas many of these believe that the dignity of man and the living of an ethical life are not necessarily dependent on faith in a Supreme Being: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Ethical Union wishes to express its strong sense that representatives of Government should demonstrate their respect for the right of each individual to his personal interpretation of the meaning of life by recognizing in their public utterances that there are a variety of such interpretations, including a multiplicity of ways of believing in a Supreme Being and a philosophy of life independent of this belief; and be it further

Resolved, That all modern media of communication give public recognition to the proposition that the fulfillment of the obligations of citizenship and the leading of a moral life are possible for every individual, whatever his personal religious beliefs.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York, N. Y., May 14, 1954.

Re Senate Joint Resolution 87.

HON. WILLIAM E. LANGER,
*United States Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The American Civil Liberties Union, as a private nonpartisan organization devoted to the furtherance of the Bill of Rights, wishes to express its opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 87.

The union feels that the resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ would violate our traditional doctrine of separation of church and state, which has done much to protect the freedom to worship as one pleases.

We respectfully urge that you place this letter into the record.

Very truly yours,

PATRICK MURPHY MALIN,
Executive Director.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE,
New York 16, N. Y., May 12, 1954.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Our attention has been called to the scheduled public hearing on May 13, 1954, on Senate Joint Resolution 87. Section 1 of this resolution declares that, "This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and

law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations." Section 2 provides that the amendment shall not be interpreted to "result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage." Section 3 would give the Congress power "to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

According all due respect for those of the country's religious faiths which are, at least in part, based upon the "authority and law" of Jesus Christ, we record the unqualified opposition of the American Jewish Committee to this proposed amendment.

The commitment of "this Nation" to the "authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations" is so disturbingly vague as to invite conflict with duly constituted authority and law already existing—a conflict, we are certain, that is not intended.

More important, however, it is well to point out that one of the major contributions made by American democracy to western civilization is the concept of religious freedom and religious tolerance. Historically and traditionally, all religions have been welcomed and all have flourished here. In the United States they have been free from governmental domination or interference. This has been true because the Founding Fathers accepted the principle that matters of religious faith and belief are outside the competence of civil authority. Recently, the United States Supreme Court reaffirmed this principle when it said, "Ours is a Government which by the 'law of its being' allows no statute, State or National, that prohibits the free exercise of religion" (*Kedroff v. St. Nicholas Cathedral*, 344 U. S. 94, 121 (1952)).

The very fact that section 3 of the proposed amendment was thought essential, evidences the objectionable character of Senate Joint Resolution 87.

We, therefore, respectfully urge that the proposed Senate Joint Resolution 87 be rejected because: (1) What it seeks to achieve is beyond the competence of civil authority; (2) its purpose is inappropriate for a Constitution, which is the basic law of a nation consisting of many religious groups, denominations, and sects; (3) it is in derogation of the accepted principle of voluntarism in religion in American life; and (4) it may compromise the allegiance of some religious groups to the Constitution which, for all groups now and since the country's founding, has been an instrument for unification rather than divisiveness.

If Senate Joint Resolution 87 is to be considered beyond the preliminary hearing scheduled for May 13, 1954, we should like to reserve the privilege of submitting a longer, more detailed statement of our opposition.

Respectfully,

EDWIN J. LUKAS.

STATEMENT OF DAVID BRODY, COUNSEL TO THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

Mr. BRODY. Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief statement, please? I am David Brody. I am the Washington counsel of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

I think one unfortunate impression has been created here, not intentionally, I am sure. The issue has been posited as a Christian-Jewish issue.

I think, and my good friends from the Christian Amendment Movement, Mr. Robb and Mr. McKnight will agree, that, just as there are good Christians in this audience, who favor Senate Joint Resolution 87, there are many good Christians, including leading Christian denominations, who are equally opposed to it and who feel that Senate Joint Resolution 87 is not an appropriate item for congressional consideration. They feel, just as the Jews do, that it is more important to have religion written into the hearts and minds of the American people than into our Constitution.

Incidentally I did not come here with any intention of making any statement, but I am doing so only because of what I have observed this afternoon.

I might say, too, that the omission of any reference to Jesus Christ in our Constitution was not an oversight, nor was it because of the fact that our Founding Fathers were not a deeply religious people. It was simply because they had before them the experience of the religious turmoil and conflicts in Europe.

I might say, too, that not only have Americans of Jewish faith prospered in this country but people of all faiths have prospered in this country because this is a democratic country based on principles of religious freedom, and history has shown us that all people, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew alike, have suffered and have suffered intensely and have lost their lives in those countries which have rejected religion, Communist Russia and Nazi Germany.

While I might say to all you gentlemen that I have been impressed by your testimony, by your sincerity, and by your convictions, my only regret is that one of the earlier witnesses representing the Militant Christian Patriots used the occasion of her testimony on this issue to array one religious group against another religious group. In these critical times what we need in this country is not divisiveness but a spirit of unity.

Dr. MARTIN. There is one question that I am in doubt about and I would like to go away from here with a clear understanding as to just what our friends here actually want. I know they are against any Christian amendment.

There are a great many religious features in our national life, prayers in Congress, and I do not need to go through all that, the oath, and all that.

Do I understand that your theory, Rabbi Breslau, is that civil government has to do with material things and should leave religion out altogether, no recognition of God, the God of the Hebrew as well as the God of the Christian, no recognition of Him in any part of your national life, no prayers in Congress, no oath to God as we have, nothing of that sort, and that no matter what religion, whether it is the Jewish or Christian or Mohammedan or Buddhist or what, the Government should have nothing to do with that? That is what I mean by secular. I would like to know when I go away from here whether that is your view, that what there is of religion in our Government ought to be eliminated, all this religion we have spoken about in State constitutions.

Now if you will answer that, then I think I can go away knowing just what you are for. As it is, frankly I just do not know.

Rabbi BRESLAU. Does that require a "Yes" or "No" answer, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. I will help you out, Rabbi. Lots of times in the Senate we have a rabbi who opens the Senate with a prayer.

Rabbi BRESLAU. If I were permitted to draft a question with the same kind of involvement as you enjoyed, sir, I am afraid you could not answer "Yes" or "No" either.

Certainly we believe as you believe, as we all believe—I find it difficult to phrase it, sir, in the sense that you can understand. We are not against the suggestion of the inclusion of the idea of God in our Government and our American life. The Senator pointed out on

occasion Jewish rabbis will present the blessing at the opening of the session as well as Catholic or Christian ministers may.

We do believe, however, that the propagation of a religious idea, of religious teaching, is not the function of the Government but the function of the individual, the family, in his own communal organization and such other organizations as he establishes for the advancement of cultural need of his own family.

We believe that we will accomplish our purpose far better if we do not try to shift our burden to the house of legislators but carry it ourselves. We believe that if we carry the responsibility of religious education, and that is where the crux of the matter is, sir, with regard to a religious people, and religious education carried out, I think we can accomplish some results.

There seems to be a tendency in American life, as we grow more prosperous, to shift our responsibilities, to find specialists for all things. Now we are trying to find a shortcut to the religious objective by getting some congressional action that will be taking it off our hands and that once passed it is all right.

We discovered when we once passed a law, the prohibition law, that it did not accomplish our objective. Mr. Howard will speak on the passage of the prohibition law, that it did not accomplish anything, but the education of the American people with regard to that particular field can accomplish a great deal.

Mr. MARTIN. We have public schools.

Rabbi BRESLAU. I think our public schools are advancing the ideals of religion as much as any institution possibly could. I think the teaching in the public school as much as the elements in government basically stem from the tradition, from the Christian tradition.

Mr. MARTIN. If the Government takes over education of all American youth for 6 days a week and leaves the church 1 day left, and then leaves God and religion out altogether, is that not setting itself up against a personal experience?

The CHAIRMAN. The Government has never taken it over. It left that to the States.

Mr. MARTIN. That is right.

Rabbi BRESLAU. I understood it in that context.

When I was a youngster my father and mother were deeply religious people, and they were concerned about my religious education, especially since I was here and spent most of my time in what appeared to them at the time as a non-Jewish environment. They wanted me to have a good Jewish religious education. Do you know what I did when I got through with public school? At 4 o'clock I went to the Hebrew school for 2 hours 5 days a week. My father and mother thought it important enough that I have that kind of education and made provision for it. I did not take dancing lessons or piano lessons or things like that. I did not take some of these other things. My father thought that religious instruction was more important than some of these other activities. So my brothers and sisters went to religious school 5 days a week.

In the synagogue with which I was associated we had Sunday school. We were not satisfied that our Sunday schools were giving sufficient instruction. We could not take the child an hour or two on the Sabbath morning and give him all the instruction he required. So we expanded our program. In most of our Jewish synagogues today

you will find at least 2 days' instruction, 3 days a week of religious instruction.

In our own America here is our own culture, you are living among your own with everything in your favor. Why can you not do the same thing? Can you not expand on religious education in the same measure that we have? Can you not work for the instruction of our children to that degree? Why shift it to the Government and blame Government?

I think Government is doing a great deal for us in our public-school system and in all the other support our Government gives to the democratic way of life.

The CHAIRMAN. Miss Applewhite.

Miss APPLEWHITE. Mr. Brody, you implied that I had created a feeling of division. I read only from your own publication.

Mr. BRODY. But you tried to create an impression that this publication was attacking the Christian religion.

Miss APPLEWHITE. It is.

Mr. BRODY. Far from it. Jewish organizations believe in nothing but the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. We respect each person's religion.

Mr. McKNIGHT. I should like to ask the rabbi a question.

Rabbi BRESLAU. Before I am asked any more questions I want to assure you that I am not even the final authority on Jewish matters or on religion.

The CHAIRMAN. You are the best one we have here today.

Rabbi BRESLAU. Thank you.

Mr. McKNIGHT. In your speech you made a remark that you did not want to take an oath, a qualified oath of any kind, that the Christian amendment might not possibly have your people in mind. Did I understand that correctly, that that would be one objection to having the amendment, that you would then be a person compelled to take a modified or qualified oath, you could not take it without reservation?

Rabbi BRESLAU. That is your device included in the amendment to permit me to take any kind of an oath. I object to the proposition that my Constitution shall establish that I must recognize Jesus Christ as the Supreme Ruler of the Universe. I have no objection to recognizing God.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand the rabbi to say under section 3 he did not know what kind of oath Congress might at some time in the future devise and they might prescribe some kind of oath there that he could not subscribe to.

Mr. McKNIGHT. Being a Christian who admits that Jesus Christ is supreme, who believes He is supreme, can I take the oath?

Rabbi BRESLAU. Sure, there is nothing to prevent you from doing it.

Mr. McKNIGHT. Could I not be consistent and state that Jesus is supreme?

Rabbi BRESLAU. Has it been offensive to you to take the oath as presently administered in court?

Mr. McKNIGHT. I am talking about taking an oath to the Constitution when I am being inducted into office.

Rabbi BRESLAU. I do not understand you, sir. You mean we are compelled to take an oath which does not include the mention of God?

Mr. McKNIGHT. That is right.

Mr. COLEMAN. In the Constitution as drawn up they had the fugitive-slave law. Everyone was required to send back slaves who were trying to escape. My forefathers were on the underground railroad, some of them. They helped slaves to escape. They did not believe in slavery but they could not take an unqualified oath to the Constitution unless it allowed them to say "subject to my supreme allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ."

Would you be in favor of allowing Christians to have a second-class oath?

Rabbi BRESLAU. Of course not.

Mr. COLEMAN. Subject to my allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ I do this, not subject to the people but to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Rabbi BRESLAU. In the civil court you take a civil oath. In a religious action you take a religious oath.

Mr. COLEMAN. You take an oath to obey, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution as it is, and if you believe that the Lord Jesus Christ has all the authority, then if any conflict comes between what the Government may order you to do as in the McIntosh case and what you believe the Lord Jesus Christ would order you to do, would you be in favor of setting up a situation that the Christian would obey the Lord Jesus Christ rather than the Government?

Rabbi BRESLAU. You are asking me a question which the Supreme Court of the United States was threatened with when the Witness Jehovah wanted to make that reservation of like nature. I do not think it involves that at all.

Dr. MARTIN. The Supreme Court has already met that issue. They met it in the McIntosh case and by a majority of one decided that McIntosh could not be naturalized because he put his allegiance to God above his allegiance to this country. That stood until 1946. In the Girard case when that whole thing came up again, that same naturalization case, and the Supreme Court said it was up for restudy, after they had restudied the whole thing they said that the former decision was wrong and that a man could take an oath to the Constitution of the United States and still maintain his supreme allegiance to Almighty God. The Supreme Court has ruled on that.

That will solve all these difficulties. I do not agree with some of my own friends here that when you take an oath to the Constitution it is absolute, unqualified. That is totalitarianism. According to our history down through the years the people do not believe that. And when the Supreme Court ruled on that, why I think that ought to solve this problem here about the oath.

Mr. COLEMAN. The Supreme Court decided in the Girard case that Congress had the right to require a man to serve even though he conscientiously objected to military service, but he had not so declared. They had the right to declare it. Therefore, they did not enforce it in the Girard case, but if Congress so chose, under the Girard case the Supreme Court decided it might so choose to prevent him being naturalized. The Congress would be acting under the Constitution.

This has been a practical problem with some men to take their oath subject to the supreme allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ. That has been a battleground. I was asking our brothers here, that would even give us second-class citizenship if we are ready for that. He has not been ready.

Mr. WILSON. In your discussion you made reference several times to the term "church and state." You continue to raise the problem. Is it your opinion that the amendment as proposed involves a continuance or a raising of a new problem of union of church and state or is there no distinction between a recognition of the basis of technical and moral civil government and a union of church and state? In other words, does this constitutional amendment involve a union of church and state?

Mr. PFEFFER. I think that certainly it is inconsistent with the separation of church and state. I think that is not a decision which I have made. It is a decision which Madison and Jefferson made and which all the members of the Constitutional Convention made when they adopted the prohibition against religious test.

Mr. WILSON. Do you believe that the term "religion" means religion in general or does it mean the establishment of a particular sect or denomination?

Mr. PFEFFER. As I indicated to you, Jefferson interpreted, and also the constitutional fathers—nobody proposed that Episcopalianism or Methodism or Seventh-day Adventism be established as preferred in the Constitution. The only thing proposed was Christianity and Christ be invoked. That was rejected because it was felt to be an infringement upon the separation of church and state or, to use Madison's statement, the independence of religion and government. It is not a decision which I made. As I say, I would like to abide by their judgment. I think it was a good judgment.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, there is apparently a difference of opinion then as to the meaning of the terms used. I am not qualified to give a final decision as to what they meant. It has been our opinion, however, that one of the bases of debate at that Convention was whether or not a specific secular or denomination should be established and it was against that type of establishment to which they dissented.

Mr. PFEFFER. May I point out to you that in 1784 there was a proposal in Virginia to establish the Christian religion or establish a provision for Christian teaching whereby a tax would be imposed upon every person who state in paying his tax to the local sheriff, to the local tax collector, "I am a Methodist, I want my money to go to the Methodist religion"; "I am a Baptist, I want my money to go to the Baptist religion"; "I am an Episcopalian, I want my money to go to the Episcopalian religion." That proposal was presented to the Legislature of Virginia. Madison strongly opposed it. In his opposition he issued a very great document, one of the great documents of religious liberty in this country in which he opposed that, not because of the establishment of Methodism but because it imposed or it gave to a secular government, a government of politicians and political persons, jurisdiction over the matter of God, of godlessness.

He said that this country has developed religion to a high state and, as has been pointed out by many observers, that nowhere in the world does religion have such a high status, where God is esteemed so highly, given so much reverence and respect; nowhere in the world but in the United States, because they have not intervened in the political field. They have not sullied themselves with sometimes the slime of politics, and with all due deference, it does not include any Member of the United States Senate, but it does include the fact that occasionally politics are a dirty thing and because our forefathers

were men of religious feeling they wanted to assure that religion shall not be subject to this possible degrading influence, and therefore they said church and state shall be separate, secular government be not inveighed on the field of religion. That is why we have the great status of religion in this country.

Mr. WILSON. Reference has been made that since we have had this concept of separation of state and church are we not living in a time when the issues have shifted some degree wherein we are now called upon to now declare the basis of our moral and religious freedoms?

Mr. PFEFFER. History has a peculiar way of repeating itself because our principle, our concept, our Constitution was adopted at a very similar period just when the forces of atheism, revolution, were coming out of France. Remember, the Revolution was in 1789. It was just during that period when people were making the same argument, is it not now the time to declare ourselves free and independent and different from those atheists, those secularists of the French Revolution who are going out to change the towns and abolish God, and so on? Then as now our forefathers knew that the best way, the surest way, to preserve the moral foundation on which religion is based is to make sure that religion and state do not intervene in each other's affairs, that religion will not be sullied by being descended into the mire of political life. That is what they said.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, you have been very gracious. It is nearly 6 o'clock. I would like to make a motion which you cannot put, that this group express our appreciation of the patience and the fairness with which Senator Langer has carried out this hearing.

Mr. PFEFFER. I second that.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. COLEMAN. All in favor of this motion will please rise.

(The motion was carried unanimously.)

The CHAIRMAN. We will adjourn the hearing subject to the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 5:45 p. m., an adjournment was taken subject to the call of the Chair.)